

# Concordia

## Theological Monthly

---

Vol. XII

JUNE, 1941

No. 6

---

### Verbal Inspiration — a Stumbling-Block to the Jews and Foolishness to the Greeks

(Continued)

It is unworthy of a Christian to charge Holy Scripture with errors. — It might be well to emphasize and elaborate some of the points touched upon in the preceding articles. First, it is unworthy of a Christian to let fallible men exercise authority over Scripture. It is a shameful thing for a Christian theologian to revise and correct Scripture on the authority of some historian or some professor of natural history. Theologians are doing just that. What about the statement of Mark that Herodias, the wife of Herod Antipas, had been the wife of Philip, the brother of Herod, Mark 6:17? Dr. Haussleiter of Greifswald (Lutheran) said: "Here, it seems, a historical error has crept in. Josephus, who was fully informed regarding the complicated relationships of the family of the Herodians, names *Herod* [a half-brother of Herod Antipas] as the first husband of Herodias. According to Josephus, Philip was the son-in-law [the husband of Salome] of Herodias and not her first husband." (See *Lehre und Wehre*, 53, p. 426.) So Josephus is a better authority than Mark, and Mark stands corrected. *The Expositor's Greek Testament* indicates the solution of this difficulty: "He, Herod [a half-brother of Herod Antipas], may of course have borne another name, such as Philip," but makes the fatal concession: "Even if there be a slip, it is a matter of small moment," etc. Wohlenburg, in Zahn's Commentary, operates in precisely the same way: "Entweder liegt hier bei Markus ein *verzeihlicher Irrtum* vor, oder jener erste Gemahl der Herodias hiess Herodes Philippus." According to these theologians the historical statement of Mark is either false or subject to doubt because of the greater or equal authority of a second-rate secular historian. — A similar case is discussed by Dr. J. C. Mattes in

*Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, 64, p. 553. He quotes from F. C. Grant's *The Gospel of the Kingdom*: "Mark's story of John's martyrdom (6:17-29), following his rebuke of Herod's unlawful marriage, does not contradict the statement of Josephus and may be accepted as an added detail explaining Herod's antagonism — though the tale has the features of a later legend, and a *motif* completely different from that of the account in Josephus,"<sup>27)</sup> and comments: "Apparently the gospels on occasion cannot be as reliable as the accounts of a secular historian, even those of one who handles his materials as apologetically as Josephus." Josephus is a *historian*; Mark tells a *tale*, a legend. — What was back of all the trouble about King Belshazzar? The old secular writers Berosus and Herodotus have a different name for the last ruler of the Babylonian kingdom. And Berosus and Herodotus are trustworthier than Daniel. — "Because Herodotus had written: 'There are no vineyards in Egypt,' and Plutarch had declared: 'Kings began to drink wine from the time of King Psammetichus,' the writer of Genesis 40 must be mistaken when he affirmed that the Pharaoh of Joseph's time drank wine." (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, Jan., 1941, p. 117. Other similar cases are recounted there.)

Is the arboriculturist a better authority in his field than Paul? Of course he is, says Dr. R. F. Stamm. The arboriculturist has the right to show that Paul slipped in Rom. 11:17 ff. Paul did not know much about the art of grafting. Having quoted a statement dealing with this matter, the Gettysburg professor comments: "This is an interesting suggestion and a possible explanation; but one has the feeling that Paul, the man of the city, is here involved in his usual difficulty when he attempts an illustration from nature or from agriculture." (*The Luth. Church Quart.*, 1935, p. 320.) On matters biological the word of the professor of biology counts for more than that of Moses or Paul. For, says Dr. A. Traver, "the Bible is not a text for biology or for chemistry." "Bible-writers wrote with the background of their age and scientific belief." (*The Lutheran*, 1939, May 10, Feb. 22.) What about natural history? Professor Baumgaertel says: "If you want information on natural-history matters, go to the natural-history authorities." (See W. Moeller *Um die Inspiration der Bibel*, p. 31.)

And so all along the line. The Liberals declare: "Modern historical and literary criticism, not to mention 'science' generally, has rendered it [the doctrine of "the plenary verbal inspiration of Holy Scripture"] increasingly untenable." (*Christendom*, I, p. 243.)

27) Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, XVIII, 5: Herod feared that John's activities might stir up a revolt and for that reason executed him. Footnote in Demme's translation: "Der Evangelist gibt uns wohl die Ursache richtiger an, warum des edeln Täuflers Haupt fiel." (P. 508.)

And when the conservative commissioners of the U. L. C. declared that they were "unable to accept the statement that the Scriptures are the infallible truth 'also in those parts which treat of historical, geographical, and other secular matters'" (*Minutes of the 1938 Convention of the U. L. C. A.*, p. 468), they declared that secular scholars are on some points more reliable than the sacred writers.

Must we, then, call in secular scholars to correct a given text before we preach from that text in our pulpits? The Liberals of the extreme left are ready to do that. And we can understand why they can do that. They look upon the Bible as the product of men, subject to the criticism of men. Speaking for the Liberals of the extreme left, R. Ingersoll declares: "We should read the Bible as we do every other book; and everything good in it, keep it; and everything that shocks the brain and shocks the heart, throw it away." (*Lectures of Col. R. J. Ingersoll*, p. 357.) Dr. Willett agrees with Ingersoll on this point. "These writings were not supernaturally produced" (*The Bible through the Centuries*, p. 254). These Liberals feel justified in subjecting the Bible to the criticism and correction of the historian and the scientist. But how can he do it who believes that "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God"? We certainly are not going to tell our Bible class that, when Mark wrote that Herodias had been the wife of Philip, God permitted him to forget his history and to contradict the great historian Josephus. We are certainly not going to read the Christmas Gospel from our pulpit and tell our people that we shall have to omit verse 2 of Luke 2 because Luke blundered concerning Cyrenius, the Governor of Syria, and then tell them that the rest is Gospel-truth. Luther would not do it. Believing that "Scripture has never erred" and "cannot err," "that God does not lie nor does His Word lie" (XIX:1309; XV:1481; XX:798), he would not listen to any historian or any scientist whose story differed from that of the Bible. He studied the historians very closely; but: "I set Scripture above them. I make use of them in such a way that I am not compelled to contradict Scripture. For I believe that in Scripture the God of truth is speaking, but in the histories good people have done the best they could; they strove to be exact, but they were men! Or perhaps the copyists erred." (XIV:491.) It is inconceivable how one who believes in Inspiration would want to charge Scripture with errors because certain learned men disagree with Scripture. It is the word of fallible men against the word of the infallible God.<sup>28)</sup>

28) The conservative moderns protest that they are not preferring the words of fallible men to God's words, for the portions of Scripture under consideration are not God's words, but the words of fallible men. Then they will have to say that every once in a while the inspiring

Put it another way: the moderns are actually advising us to tell our people that certain portions of Scripture are not inspired, because otherwise the attacks of the infidels will prove successful. In other words: we cannot uphold the trustworthiness of the Bible unless we admit errors in it. They are actually giving this advice. Professor Evans, quoted with approval by De Witt (*op. cit.*, p. 43), says: "You may be sure that, so long as you hang the infallible authority of Scripture as the rule of faith on the infallible accuracy of every particular word and clause in the Book, . . . the irrepressible conflict between faith and science will go on. . . ." If the Church would only admit at once and unreservedly that the Bible contains the mistakes charged up against it by the historian and the scientist, "the iridescent declaration of Robert Ingersoll in his *Mistakes of Moses* would collapse like a pricked balloon." One cannot trust one's eyes. Surrender parts of the Bible in order to save the rest! By way of appeasement the Church must maintain herself!

What do you think of a theology which is at the beck and call of science and is glad to act as her train-bearer, "Schleppentraegerdienste zu tun"? 29)

The Christian disgraces himself when he asks fallible men to tell him how much of his Holy Bible he may accept. Take the lowest view of the case. We demand that the holy writers, say the Biblical historians, be treated as respectably as secular historians. Why should we take it for granted that in a case of conflict the heathen or the Jew should be right, but Daniel and Mark wrong? Daniel is entitled to at least as much consideration as Herodotus. Why not operate with the hypothesis that Josephus might have blundered? Why say *a priori* that Mark and Luke blundered? Read Dr. Lenski on Luke 2:2: "Luke was charged

---

activity of the Holy Ghost ceased; that every so often—and that was very often—the Holy Ghost left the holy writers to their own devices; that He permitted the Bible, the book of life, to become a conglomerate of truth and error; and that He put it up to the anxious sinner to search the Scriptures in order to separate the truth from the error. Is such a monstrous conception of the work of the Holy Ghost worthy of a Christian? And is it worthy of a Christian to say that the inspired words "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God" do not express the full truth?

29) Moeller's phrase. Read the entire paragraph. "Es fragt sich, ob es gut ist, sofort beim ersten Kanonenschuss der Feinde die Aussenwerke zu räumen, um die Festung selbst halten zu wollen, um so mehr, wenn es sich um einen blinden Schuss und um schwache Feinde handelt. Die heutige Theologie verbeugt sich vor jeder Wissenschaft oder auch oft Pseudowissenschaft und Naturphilosophie, die den Mund etwas voll nimmt, und erklärt sich bereit, Schleppentraegerdienste zu tun. Das ist ein erbarmungs- und unwürdiger Zustand, der ein Ende nehmen muss!" (*Op. cit.*, p. 36.)

with misdating this enrolment. What helped the matter along were the mistaken statements of Josephus (on which see Zahn in his commentary on Luke). The word of the renegade Jewish priest Josephus, born as late as 37 or 38 A.D., was taken against the word of Paul's faithful assistant, the inspired writer Luke, who was an active member in the church at Antioch as early as the year 40. Recently discovered inscriptions vindicate Luke."<sup>30</sup> Omit the "inspired" and the concluding sentence and get the point we are at present stressing. Dr. Stoeckhardt thus stresses the point: "Who will forbid us, where the testimony of one witness counts for as much as that of the other, to accept the testimony of the Bible?" (*Lehre und Wehre*, 32, p. 316.) Those who say that the testimony of the secular writer has the preference, are swayed by bias. That is unworthy of a "historical critic." And it is unworthy of a Christian.

The matter gets worse when we realize that these fallible men who are set above Scripture are indeed fallible men who have been convicted time and again of making false statements. Josephus is not an absolutely reliable historian. "It should no longer be denied that Josephus contradicts himself in his account of the census under Quirinius as in other accounts, constructs from different accounts of the same facts different facts, and commits other blunders." (Zahn, *Commentary on Luke*, p. 130.) "The testimony of Professor Sayce to the inaccuracy of Herodotus and other ancient writers is as follows: 'Let us now turn to the classical writers who have left accounts of the ancient history of the East. Among them Herodotus and Ktesias of Knidos claim our first attention. Herodotus has been termed "the Father of History." . . . Ktesias had access to the state archives of Persia; on the strength of these he maintained that Herodotus had "lied," and he wrote a work with the object of contradicting most of the older historians' statements. But when confronted with contemporaneous monuments, Herodotus and Ktesias alike turn out to be false guides.'" (D. MacDill, *The Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch*, p. 163.) These "good people," says Luther, did their best but could not help blundering. The man on the street knows that the historians of the present day spend much of their time in correcting the mistakes of the historians of yesterday. And still the moderns faulted our fathers for refusing to trust Josephus more than Mark.

30) Zahn, page 129: "Es will doch nicht einleuchten, warum, wo es sich um Ereignisse der Zeit zwischen 7 v. Chr. und 7 n. Chr. handelt, geschichtliche Angaben des griechischen Arztes und Christen Lukas, der schon vor dem Regierungsantritt des Kaisers Claudius ein erwachsenes Mitglied der Gemeinde zu Antiochien war, von vornherein misstrauischer angesehen werden sollen, als Angaben des ehemaligen Priesters Josephus, der zu Ende 37 oder Anfang 38 geboren ist."

It is unbelievable. Dr. Stoeckhardt tells them: "Will you say that secular history gives the lie to Scripture? . . . Are we to correct the Biblical history on the authority of occasional scraps in the ancient tradition or the obscure language of the monuments, which are partly contradictory . . . ? Das waere Wahnwitz," (*Lehre und Wehre*, 32, p. 315.)

This applies to all branches of human knowledge. Are the geologists who would master Moses infallible? Then why do the geological theories change so often, so often that the layman cannot keep count? "Of the eighty (geological) theories which the French Institute counted in 1806 as hostile to the Bible, not one now stands." (A. T. Pierson in *Fundamentals*, 7, p. 63.) And has higher criticism, for our moderns the queen of sciences, established any assured results? Is there any finality there?<sup>31)</sup> The science of one epoch is abandoned by the science of the next. (See Gladstone, *The Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture*, p. 49.) We would invite the critics to spend their time in searching out the discrepancies in the secular writings. They will then feel less inclined to produce them as witnesses against the Bible.—The judge would disgrace himself who consented to try a case where the plaintiff is unable to produce unimpeachable witnesses. And the Christian disgraces himself if he permits fallible men to testify against the infallible Bible.<sup>32)</sup>

---

31) In his latest book, *A Philosophy of the Christian Revelation*, Edwin Lewis mentions on page 34 "the reverberations of the bitter controversy of the so-called Documentary Hypothesis of the Pentateuch," the old "symbols J, E, D, and P," and says: "That chapter in the history of criticism may now be regarded as closed." Other theories now have their day—and it will be a short day. The tragic thing, however, is that in the very next paragraph Dr. Lewis assails Verbal Inspiration on the strength of "facts" furnished by higher criticism. He says: "The Church had unfortunately committed itself to a type of verbalism. . . ." He rejoices over "the breaking of the stranglehold of this verbalism." "How mixed-up the message [of the Pentateuch] is with transient and purely human elements can hardly be denied except by a doctrinaire who persists in closing his eyes to facts."

32) A final word on the unscholarly habits of the discrepancy-hunters, as evidenced by Dr. Haussleiter. A later article, dealing with the "Biblical errors," will discuss other instances. What the *Expositor's Greek Testament* and *Zahn's Commentary* say in a half-hearted way we want to express in stronger terms. It is frivolous to charge Mark with a historical error "on the assumption that Herod the Great could have only one son named Philip" (Lenski's *Commentary*). Dr. Haussleiter and his ilk should take the trouble of studying the genealogical table of the Herodians. Herod had two sons named Philip; one (the husband of Herodias) by Mariamne, the other (the tetrarch) by Cleopatra. Even so two of his sons bore the name of Antipas. For two half-brothers to bear the same name in a family like that of Herod the Great is nothing unusual. Haussleiter constructed the "historical error" by ignoring a matter of common occurrence. For his benefit we shall also mention the other historical fact that Salome, the daughter of Herodias and

And now let us take high ground. We shall take our stand on the impregnable rock of Holy Scripture. We take this position: even if the historians and the scientists and the philosophers had never been convicted of a single error, misstatement, or inaccuracy, we would say that in every case where they contradict Scripture they are in error, and Scripture is right. To say less than that is unworthy of a Christian. If all the philosophers and scientists were united in declaring one statement of Scripture to be false, we would tell them that this little verse of Scripture will stand as true in all eternity. The Christian has no difficulty to say with Luther: "God's Word counts for more than all angels and saints and creatures" (XVIII:1322) and historians and philosophers. He encounters insuperable difficulties in saying that in this instance the scientists are right and Scripture is wrong.

We shall tell the philosophers that, where doctrine is concerned, they know nothing of these things and that the declaration of Scripture is conclusive and decisive. And we shall tell them another thing: on these matters we know more than you. You may know a lot more about science than we do. But do not talk to us on matters of faith. "To be able to judge the Bible, a man needs spiritual sense. I would as soon expect a man to appreciate the Sistine Madonna because he was not color-blind as to expect an unspiritual man to understand and appreciate the Bible simply because he understands the laws of grammar and the vocabulary of the languages in which the Bible was written. I would as soon think of setting a man to teach Art merely because he understood

---

the disinherited Philip (the first husband of Herodias) married the tetrarch Philip, her half-uncle. Furthermore, when Josephus named Herod as the first husband of Herodias, he was right; when Mark gave his name as Philip, he was right. The two historians are not contradicting each other. The trouble is not with Josephus (in this instance) and Mark; the trouble is with Haussleiter and the other critics. They misinterpret one of their historians.—Mark was not a shallow examiner; Haussleiter proved himself a superficial reader.

There are other similar cases. Examining the case of the Gadarene swine, Gladstone remarks: "Both Bishop Wordsworth in his *Commentary* and Archbishop Trench refer to Josephus. I am, however, under the impression that both these excellent authors may have insufficiently examined the effect of the passages in Josephus which relate to the subject." (*Op. cit.*, p. 326. These passages listed and examined there.) So we have this situation: to prove the errancy of Scripture, secular writers are quoted. That is inadmissible. Secondly, the secular writers relied upon as witnesses are in many cases shown to be in error. And in the third place, the charge of "errors in the Bible" rests in some case on a misinterpretation of the secular authority. We read this the other day: "As down payment on an automobile, a man in Tarrytown, N. Y., tendered three \$50 bills. They were not only Confederate money but counterfeit." The statements of scientists and historians are in this matter not legal tender. Sometimes they are erroneous, counterfeit. And where there is misinterpretation of the secular authority, the counterfeit of the outlawed money is mutilated beyond recognition.

paints, as to set him to teach the Bible merely because he understood Greek and Hebrew and Aramaic." (R. A. Torrey, *Is the Bible the Inerrant Word of God?* P. 46.) See 1 Cor. 2:14. The Christian would be degrading himself and belittling his spiritual faculties if he asked Kant and Fosdick to tell him how many of the Bible doctrines he may believe.

And with regard to secular matters we shall tell them that what Scripture says about creation and the husband of Herodias and the grafting of olive-branches is absolutely true. If they agree, well; if not, they are wrong. "One passage of Scripture has more authority than all the books in the world." (Luther, XIX:1734.) We should hold this one passage even if all the philosophers from Plato down to Santayana and all scientists from Pythagoras to Einstein declared it erroneous. A Christian can say nothing less. "Wir muessen so keck werden, allen Menschenwitz und alles, was von Menschen kommt, mit Fuessen zu treten, sobald es die Worte Christi betrifft. . . . Was kuemmert's mich was dieser oder jener begabte Suender ueber dieses oder jenes denkt, heisse er nun Schleiermacher oder Storr oder Kant oder Swedenborg, oder wie er will." (Hofacker. See *Lehre und Wehre*, 57, p. 137.) Let us be as bold as Walther: "Let science publicize ever so confidently the results of its research as absolutely certain truths, we do not regard science but only Scripture as infallible. When the results of scientific research contradict clear statements of Scripture, we are certain before all investigation that these teachings of science are absolutely not true, even if we are unable to prove this save by our appeal to Scripture. As often as we must choose between science and Scripture, we say with Christ, our Lord: 'The Scripture cannot be broken,' John 10:35, and with the holy apostle: 'We bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ,' 2 Cor. 10, 5." (See *Christliche Dogmatik*, I, p. 190.)

The Christian, though he be a mere layman, must be bold enough to challenge not only the philosopher but also the erring theologian. Here is a fine Christian manifesto, issued by Der Deutsche Ev.-Luth. Schulverein (150 members): "We maintain the miracle of Inspiration and believe that the Bible is, word for word, God's Word. . . . Over against the testimony of Christ and His apostles the wisdom of the most learned professors and D.D.'s is, for us, nothing but wind. You may look down upon us as unlearned laymen. We shall hold our position in spite of that." (*Lehre und Wehre*, 55, p. 234.)

When the experts discuss scientific matters, we keep our mouths shut. And we are aware that some of these men, many of them, know more Greek and Aramaic than we do. And more than our high-school boy. But we tell this boy that, when his

teacher begins to charge the Bible with historical and scientific errors, he should open his mouth in protest. He need not be abashed and apologetic. He should say: In this matter "I have more understanding than all my teachers," Ps. 119:99.

It might happen, of course, and it will happen, that the professor gets the young man in a corner. The young man cannot solve the historical or chronological difficulty. And then perhaps the young man will worry and give up his case as lost. But that would be unworthy of him as a Christian. That is the next point that needs to be emphasized and elaborated: the Christian is not taking the right attitude if he permits the fact that he cannot solve all Biblical difficulties to perturb him overmuch.

Dr. Stoeckhardt had some difficulty with Matthew 27:9: "spoken by *Jeremy* the prophet." It seems that Zechariah should have been named (Zech. 11:12). And Dr. Stoeckhardt freely says: I cannot solve the difficulty, nor could the others solve it. "Instead of exhausting oneself with such vague guesses, it would have been better to confess *Non liquet* and let it go at that. It would not, after all, be the only obscure passage in Scripture which we cannot decipher." (*Lehre und Wehre*, 31, p. 272.) We do not notice that Dr. Stoeckhardt's pen was quivering when he wrote these words. Luther was equally free to confess occasionally that he was baffled. "Here, in the case of Abraham, sixty years are lost." (I:721.) They have not been located to this day. But that did not raise the suspicion with Luther that Scripture here made a mistake. On John 2:13-16: "Here the question arises how the statements of Matthew and of John harmonize. . . . Aber es sind Fragen und bleiben Fragen, die ich nicht will aufloesen. Nothing much depends on it. What do I care that there are many sharp and superclever people who raise all kinds of questions and demand an answer on every single point?" (VII:1780 f.) Peter Martyr took the same attitude: "Although obscure passages occur as to chronology, we must beware of pretending to reconcile them by imputing blunders to the inspired books. Therefore it is that, should it sometimes happen that we know not how to account for the number of years, we ought simply to confess our ignorance and consider that the Scriptures express themselves with so much conciseness that it is not always possible for us to discover at what epoch we ought to make such or such a computation to commence." (See Gaussen, *op. cit.*, p. 243.)<sup>33</sup> Here is one fact which is well established: the great theologians of the Church are not able to harmonize all "contradictions" in the Bible. Nor are they able to prove, by

---

33) "Conciseness" — that accounts for some of the difficulty. Other factors are mentioned in the same paragraph.

science, that all the scientific statements in the Bible are true; to demonstrate in all cases that the Biblical historian is right and the secular historian wrong; and to adduce corroborative testimony in all cases from outside sources. "We do not claim that every historical statement contained in the Pentateuch can be proved to be true by external testimony." (D. MacDill, *op. cit.*, p. 89.)

But this fact should not disturb us. It is not worthy of a Christian to let that fact lead him to doubt in any way the trustworthiness of Scripture. It may embarrass some to be forced to make Luther's and Peter Martyr's and Augustine's confession of ignorance,—and it should put those to shame whose ignorance is due to their neglect of serious study of the case. But we have no reason to be embarrassed and perturbed at our inability to solve all Biblical difficulties. We do not, and the most pronounced foes of Verbal Inspiration do not, feel that difficulties about a certain philosophical truth cast doubt upon that truth. When we and the Bible critics find a statement in some secular book which seems to contradict some other statement in the same book, we do not begin to hoot at the writer. "There may be difficulties with individual passages in the Bible that I in my very limited knowledge cannot explain. But a man is not a philosopher but a fool who gives up a thoroughly established theorem because there are difficulties that he cannot explain. No reputable scientist in any department of science does that." (R. A. Torrey, *op. cit.*, p. 22.) Let us give our Bible the same respectful consideration as reputable human writings receive.

And let us give it higher respect. The doubts as to the absolute and all-embracing reliability of the Bible which arise from our inability to solve every difficulty are not worthy of a Christian. God's guarantee means more than our human limitations. Read on in Torrey: "The proof that Jesus is a teacher sent from God who spoke the very words of God is absolutely conclusive; indeed, it is overwhelming, and therefore I unquestionably accept *His* say-so, however difficult it may be to reconcile with some things I seem to know. Therefore, when the Lord Jesus says, as He continually does say, that this Book is the inerrant 'Word of God,' I heartily believe it; I would be an egregious fool if I did not." (*Loc. cit.*)

We accept the *doctrines* of the Bible even though we do not understand them; and when to our finite mind two doctrines seem to be in contradiction, we do not doubt the truth of either of them. Is it worthy of a Christian to deny the universality of God's grace because certain facts of experience do not seem to agree with it? And are you taking the Christian attitude when you permit your

inability to solve minor difficulties in the Bible to raise doubts in your mind as to the reliability of the Bible?

Who told you that the Bible, if it is really God's Word, cannot contain difficulties? The Bible does not tell you that. Your Bible tells you, for instance, that in the epistles of Paul there "are some things hard to be understood" (2 Pet. 3:16). So when you meet with a difficulty in *any* part of the Bible, the Bible does not permit you to say that this part of the Bible must be deleted.

You have no cause to worry. Our faith need not suffer in the least from the fact that our mind is not omniscient. You cannot harmonize the accounts of Matthew and John on the purging of the Temple. Luther tells you: "Let it be as it will, es sei zuvor oder hernach, eins oder zwier geschehen, our faith does not suffer thereby." (VII:1781.) The chronology in the case of Arphaxad seems confused (Gen. 11:11); "one offers this solution, the other another. But, in the first place, it will not hurt us at all if we cannot find a perfectly satisfactory solution. . . . Denn das ist gewiss, dass die Schrift nicht luegt." (I:714.) The unbeliever makes much of the seeming confusion in isolated passages of Scripture; the Christian reader does not let it bother his faith: "Christliche Leser werden sich leichtlich darein finden." (II:1024.)<sup>34)</sup>

What we should worry about is that we are worried about our inability to solve all Bible difficulties. The latent distrust of the absolute infallibility of the Bible which lies at the bottom of it is a wicked thing. Another wicked thing is the pride of reason. We think that, if we cannot demonstrate that everything is in order, God's Word will suffer in the estimation of men or our own faith will suffer. Thinking these thoughts we are making our wisdom and learning the measure of the truth of God's Word. That ill befits a Christian. And if you find fault with the occurrence of these difficulties in the Bible, you are faulting the Holy Ghost.

---

34) Study the valuable observations of Luther and Pieper on this point, in *Christliche Dogmatik*, I, p. 340 ff. Read also page 56 in *Proceedings, Western District*, 1865: "Die Weltweisen berufen sich darauf, dass man in neuerer Zeit so viele Entdeckungen gemacht hat, die mit der Schrift nicht stimmen. Nach der Berechnung mancher Weltweisen muesste die Erde schon ueber 100,000 Jahre alt sein u. dgl. Solche Behauptungen moegen nun wohl manchen in Verlegenheit setzen, den Christen aber nicht. Wenn der sie auch nicht erklaren kann, so laesst er sich dadurch noch lange nicht stoeren in seinem Glauben. Dazu wissen wir ja, wie unsicher die Ergebnisse der neueren Forschung sind: was der eine heute setzt, das stoest der andere morgen um." (See above.) "Carl v. Raumer, der selbst ein tuechtiger Geologe, aber zugleich ein Christ ist, sagt: 'Ein jeder huete sich vor den Geologen, denn sie geben gern mehr als sie haben.' Wir Christen haben bei allen Einwuerfen der Wissenschaft zunaechts nur eine Antwort: Wir glauben an einen allmaechtigen Gott."

He is the Author of the Bible, and just as it was written He wanted it written. He is responsible, for instance, for the variations in the four records of the institution of the Lord's Supper. "The Holy Ghost purposely ordered it so" (Luther, XIX:1104.) Guard your tongue when wrestling with these difficulties.<sup>35)</sup>

All is not well when a Christian takes offense at "insoluble" difficulties. "The fact that you cannot solve a difficulty does not prove that it cannot be solved, and the fact that you cannot answer an objection does not prove at all that it cannot be answered. There are many who, when they meet a difficulty in the Bible and give it a few moments' thought and can see no possible solution, at once jump to the conclusion that a solution is impossible by any one, and so they throw up their faith in the inerrancy of the Bible and its divine origin. It would seem as if any really normal man would have a sufficient amount of that modesty that is becoming in beings so limited in knowledge as we all undeniably are to say: 'Though I see no possible solution of this difficulty, some one a little wiser than I might easily find one.'" (Torrey, *op. cit.*, p. 61.)

And all is well even if it is never solved for you. Pastor G. Schulze of Walsleben (Germany) has well said: "We wait for the time when the difficulty may be solved, and we die in good spirits even though this never occurs." (See Pieper, *What Is Christianity?* p. 251.)<sup>36)</sup>

---

35) And when you have solved a difficulty, when you have, for instance, established the agreement of science with Scripture on some point, do not be overproud of it. Do not imagine that that alone makes for a stronger faith. "Hence Dr. Smith observes we should not be too much elated by the discovery of harmonies." (Gladstone, *op. cit.*, p. 50.) Philippi utters the same caution. (See *Christl. Dog.*, I, p. 269.)

36) This stubborn refusal to admit that there are errors in the Bible even though the truth of certain statements cannot be demonstrated is one of the reasons why the critics charge us with dishonesty and untruthfulness. They say that we close our eyes to the facts. Kahnis makes the strong statement: "Only he will deny that Scripture contains contradictions who lacks the sense of truth." (See page 261 above.) Kahnis again: "To retain the inspiration dogma of the old dogmatics means hardening oneself against the truth." (See *Baier's Compendium*, I, p. 43.) V. Ferm uses the term "loss of intellectual integrity." E. Lewis means the same thing when he says: "Once error is known to be error, its perpetuation becomes a menace. If new facts are discovered in the field of history or in the field of science or anywhere else, no respect for tradition should hinder their being made known." (*Op. cit.*, p. 259.) In *The Christian Fact and Modern Doubt* G. A. Buttrick raises the same charge: "It is no use our evading or trying to hide Bible inconsistencies." And if our attitude is not due to intellectual dishonesty, it is, says Buttrick, due to intellectual weakness: "That avowal [literal infallibility of Scripture], held to its last logic, would risk a trip to the insane asylum." It is due to a rabbinical superstition, declares Haussleiter: "Zerstören Sie den rabbinischen Aberglauben von der Buchstabeninspiration!" (See *Lehre und Wehre*, 57, p. 479.) What should

Another point that should be emphasized and elaborated is this: those theologians who operate with the alleged errors in the Bible find themselves in disreputable company. They are working shoulder to shoulder with infidels and Jews and continuing the work begun by the old rationalists and the ancient heathen adversaries of Christianity. The moderns are using the very same arguments which the pronounced foes of the Bible have been employing in the past centuries. Their weapons have been forged in the workshop of infidelity.

Thomas Paine, the deist, and Voltaire, the scoffer, and D. F. Strauss, the skeptic and religious anarchist, and the old rationalists took up the work, and employed the arguments of Celsus. R. Ingersoll, the agnostic, with Bradlaugh in England, "the last of the Old Guard" (avowed enemies of Christianity) drew on Paine and Voltaire. And now spokesmen of the Christian Church are repeating, in some instances word for word, what those enemies of Christianity have been saying against the Bible.

Gaussen: "The Scriptures have in all ages had their adversaries, their Celsuses and Porphyries. . . . Malchus Porphyry, whom Jerome calls *ravidum adversus Christum canem*, wrote fifteen books against Christianity. The first was entirely devoted to the bringing together of all the contradictions which, he maintained, he had found in the Scriptures. From Celsus and Porphyry down to the English unbelievers of the 18th century and from these down to Strauss, *who had hardly more to do than copy them*, unceasing endeavors have been made to discover more. Strauss says himself that in the criticism of the gospels he *had studied and collected from Celsus to Paulus*, and even to the fragments of Wolfenbuettel." (*Theopneustia*, p. 208.)<sup>37</sup> MacDill: "In these two writings of Voltaire we have almost all the points and arguments that are set forth by higher criticism." (*Op. cit.*, p. 18.) R. A. Torrey: "Most of our modern infidels from Tom Paine to Robert Ingersoll, and also the reputed 'scholars' of 'the modern

be our attitude over against these charges? We shall certainly re-examine our position in the fear of God and carefully guard against any intrusion of carnal stubbornness, any intention of evading the issue. And when we, ever and again, always, come to the same conclusion and are compelled to declare: "Scripture cannot be broken," all evidence of carnal reasoning to the contrary, we shall willingly bear the contumely heaped upon us. If we are charged with dishonesty or insanity because of our championship of the truth of Scripture, the charges leave us unaffected. They are false charges, and the words of Jesus, Matt. 5:11 and Luke 6:22, apply.

37) By the way, Strauss said of his own book, *Das Leben Jesu*: "The book praises itself. It is an inspired book; that is to say, its author has laid hold of the most powerful of the driving forces of the theological science of the day and so produced the book." (See Meusel, *Kirchl. Handlexikon*, s. v. Strauss.)

critical school,' have for the most part simply echoed and embellished the arguments of that bitter enemy of Christ of the second century Celsus." (*Is the Bible the Inerrant Word of God?* p. 24.) D. F. Burrell: "All the stock arguments against the inerrancy of Scripture were presented in the *Age of Reason*." (*Why I Believe the Bible*, p. 183.) Can these grave charges be substantiated?

We offer in evidence the following excerpts from three scoffers and sceptics and ask the reader to compare them with the statements of the moderns quoted in our first article. Voltaire states: "... (7) that the accounts of prodigies and of God's strange and supernatural dealings with the Israelites in Egypt and in the desert, the ten plagues, the crossing of the Red Sea, the destruction of the Egyptian army, etc., are revolting to reason and cannot have been written by Moses." (Is not this the voice of Fosdick?) MacDill, who quotes this, says further: "The testimony of Christ and the New Testament to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch was noticed by Voltaire as by the more modern analysts, and like them, he set it aside as untrustworthy." (P. 19.) "In regard to other books of the Bible, the views of Voltaire are in accord with the analytics; we might better say, their views are in accord with his." (P. 20.) "After stating these reasons, Voltaire proceeds to decry the general contents of the Pentateuch and closes this third section of his article on Moses with these words: 'It is very pardonable in human reason to see in such history only the barbarous rudeness of a savage people of the primitive times. Man, whatever he may do, cannot reason otherwise; but if God indeed is the author of the Pentateuch, it is necessary to submit without reasoning.'" (P. 18.)<sup>38)</sup>

The following excerpts will show that the moderns (liberals, semiliberals and conservatives) are plowing with Paine's heifer. Paine exults: "I have now gone through the Bible as a man would go through a wood with an ax on his shoulder and fell trees. Here they lie; and the priests if they can, may replant them. They may perhaps stick them in the ground, but they will never make them grow. I pass on to the books of the New Testament. . . . And now, ye priests of every description, who have preached and written against the former part of the *Age of Reason*, what have ye to say? Will you, with all this mass of evidence against you, and staring you in the face, still have the assurance to march into your pulpits and continue to impose

---

38) We find ourselves in accord with this last statement. In the preceding article we told those who believe in a real inspiration of the Bible that they must accept its statements *a priori*, "without reasoning." Voltaire tells them that we were right.

these books on your congregations as the works of *inspired penmen* and the Word of God?"<sup>39)</sup>

From the "mass of evidence" presented by Paine we select the following: "I begin, then, by saying that these two chapters [Gen. 1 and 2] contain *two different and contradictory stories of a creation*, made by two different persons and written in two different styles of expression. The evidence that shows this is so clear when attended to without prejudice that, did we meet with the same evidence in any Arabic or Chinese account of a creation, we should not hesitate in pronouncing it a forgery." (Dr. G. A. Buttrick, repeated this in 1935 and said: "The doctrine of literal infallibility is slain and pursuit is needless.") "This tale of the sun standing still upon Mount Gibeon and the moon in the valley of Ajalon is one of those fables that detects itself. Such a circumstance could not have happened without being known all over the world. One half would have wondered why the sun did not rise, and the other why it did not set; and the tradition of it would be universal, whereas there is not a nation in the world that knows anything about it." (Harnack, Fosdick and the Archbishop of York, too, think that this disproves Verbal Inspiration.)—"I observed two chapters, 16th and 17th in the First Book of Samuel, that contradict each other with respect to David and the manner he became acquainted with Saul. . . . These two accounts belie each other, because each of them supposes Saul and David not to have known each other before. This book, the Bible, is too ridiculous even for criticism." The moderns have kept this item in their list to this day. Also this one: "If the parts are found to be discordant, contradicting in one place what is said in another (as in 2 Sam. 24:1 and 1 Chron. 21:1, where the same action is ascribed to God in one book and to Satan in the other), . . . we may take it for certainty that the Creator of the universe is not the author of such a book, that it is not the Word of God, and that to call it so is to dishonor His name."—"In the former part of the *Age of Reason* I have spoken of Jonah and the whale. A fit story for ridicule if it was written to be believed, or of laughter if it was intended to try what credulity could swallow; for if it

39) *The Presbyterian*, Jan. 16, 1941: "Belief in plenary inspiration of the Bible is being discarded by many today, even among the conservative element in the Church. . . . Some time ago we listened to a scholar of national reputation lecture on one of the gospels. With almost nonchalant carelessness he tore the book to shreds. This part came out; that passage was apocryphal; these verses were by a later and uninspired writer. . . ." Note, in our first article, how a Lutheran theologian tore the Gospel of Mark to shreds. Note there how the moderns go through the Bible uprooting one passage after the other. Hear them cry out: The day of Verbal Inspiration is past! Verbal Inspiration is dead!

could swallow Jonah and the whale, it could swallow anything." Dr. Fosdick's list also contains the story of Jonah and the great fish. — Jonah again: "The story of Jonah satirizes also the supposed partiality of the Creator for one nation more than for another." (Repeated, nearly verbatim, by Dr. Willet. See April number, p. 257 f.)

The moderns, as we have seen, use the "contradictory" versions of the inscription on the cross as one of their heavy guns. Paine, too. "Not any two of these writers agree in reciting *exactly in the same words* the written inscription, short as it is, which they tell us was put over Christ when He was crucified." The contradiction between the genealogies, referred to by a Lutheran theologian (page 247 above), is handled by Paine thus: "Did these two genealogies (Matt. 1 and Luke 3) agree, it would not prove the genealogy to be true, because it might, nevertheless, be a fabrication; but as they contradict each other in every particular, it proves falsehood absolutely. . . . Now, if these men, Matthew and Luke, set out with a falsehood between them in the very commencement of their history of Jesus Christ, and of whom and what he was, what authority is there left for believing the strange things they tell us afterward? If they cannot be believed in their account of his natural genealogy, how are we to believe them when they tell us He was the Son of God, begotten by a ghost, and that an angel announced this in secret to his mother? If they lied in one genealogy, why are we to believe them in another?"

Paine finds, of course, a lot of contradictions in the resurrection story. We have not the time to particularize. Nor have we given all of his objections. But we have space for two more items. "The Bible says (Jer. 20:5, 7) that God is a deceiver. 'O Lord' (says Jeremiah), 'Thou hast deceived me, and I was deceived. Thou art stronger than I and hast prevailed.'" (Dr. Dodd operates with the same passage.) — Read what Dr. Best says about the rights of reason (see second article) and then read Paine: "'Come now and let us reason together, saith the Lord.' This is one of the passages you quoted from your Bible. . . . I requote the passage to show that your *text* and your *religion* contradict each other. It is impossible to reason upon things *not comprehensible by reason*; and therefore, if you keep to your text, which priests seldom do (for they are generally either above it or below it or forget it), you must admit a religion to which reason can apply, and this certainly is not the Christian religion." (Quotations are from *Life and Writings of Thomas Paine*, Vol. 6: "Age of Reason" and other writings.)

The moderns plow with Ingersoll's heifer, too. He says in *Mistakes of Moses*: "Every nation has had what you call a sacred record; and the older, the more sacred, the more contradictory, and the more inspired is the record. . . . Now, they say the book [Bible] is inspired. I do not care whether it is or not; the question is: Is it true? . . . I find in some book that the sun was stopped a whole day to give a general named Joshua time to kill a few more Amalekites. At another time, we read, the sun was turned ten degrees backward to convince Hezekiah that he was not going to die of a boil." And since this involves a stupendous astronomical error, Ingersoll and Paine and Fosdick and the Archbishop of York cannot believe in Verbal, Plenary Inspiration. — "The second account of creation differs from the first in two essential points. In the first account, man is last made; in the second, man is made before the beasts. In the first account, man is made 'male and female,' in the second, only a male is made, and there is no intention of making a woman whatever." The moderns may not agree with Ingersoll's exegesis, but both are agreed as to the general contention.

When you read the following: "Shall we reason, or shall we simply believe? Oh, but they say the Bible is not inspired about those little things. The Bible says the rabbit and the hare chew the cud. But they do not. They have a tremulous motion of the lip. But the Being that made them says they chew the cud. The Bible, therefore, is not inspired in natural history," you might think one of the moderns is speaking. Ingersoll wrote it.

The moderns will not employ the coarse language of Ingersoll, but some of them are with him when he says: "How many did they have when they went to Egypt? Seventy. How many were they at the end of two hundred and fifteen years? Three millions. That is a good many. . . . Is there a minister in the city of Chicago that will testify to his own idiocy by claiming that they could have increased to three millions by that time?" And this: "The whole supplies of the world could not maintain three millions of people in the desert of Sinai for forty years. . . . It would require millions of acres to support these flocks, and yet there was no blade of grass and there is no account of it raining baled hay."

The deadly parallel once more: N. R. Best: "When did the Creator ever brand man's reason as unholy — unfit to handle the sacred things of His words?" (See p. 353 above.) Ingersoll: "Do not imagine that there is any being who would give to his children the holy torch of reason and then damn them for following where the holy light led. . . . If God did not intend I should think, why did He give me a 'thinker?'" (Quotations from *Lecture*

of Col. R. G. Ingersoll, containing *Mistakes of Moses* and other writings.)<sup>40)</sup>

In preparing for their war against the inspiration of Scripture the moderns found munitions to their liking prepared by the ancients. And as they are marching along, the unbelievers cheer them on. When Professor Smith in Cincinnati was being tried in a court of his Church (Presbyterian) for his attacks on Scripture, a Rabbi, a Theosophist, a Buddhist, a Unitarian, a Universalist, and an atheist defended him in the secular press of the city. (See *Lutheraner*, 49, p. 28.)

The moderns are using the same arguments as the ancients and arrive at the same result. And the Liberals of today are talking the language of the unbelievers of yesterday. You cannot think hard of the *Lutheran Herald* (Jan. 21, 1941) for writing the following: "It happened that the editor picked up the current issue of a Lutheran theological quarterly while he was in the midst of reading Dr. Goodspeed's book (*How the Bible Came to Be*). There he read an article dealing pretty much with the inspiration of the Bible and discovered, what he knew more or less directly, that within the Lutheran Church in the United States we have scholars who are nicely along the road which Dr. Goodspeed is following. The book and the article side by side lead to some somber thought. Time was when the most liberal theologians in America would have shuddered to read a book which leaves the guidance of God the Holy Spirit out of the authorship of the Bible as does Dr. Goodspeed's. And here, in a Lutheran quarterly, we are

---

40) Here are some excerpts from *Origen Against Celsus* which show that Ingersoll and Paine are in accord with Celsus. "Celsus: 'The Son of God, then, it appears, could not open His tomb, but required the aid of another to roll away the stone.' . . . He ridicules the account of 'the angel's visit to Joseph regarding the pregnancy of Mary,' and the birth of God from a virgin" (his words do not bear repeating). "Their cosmogony is extremely silly." "Celsus makes jest also of the serpent, taking the narrative to be an old wife's fable." Writing the story of the Deluge and the monstrous ark, they "imagined that they were inventing stories merely for young children." (*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, IV.) Stories for children — that sounds familiar. See page 246 above. — From Porphyry's list: "He objects to the repetition of a generation in St. Matthew's genealogy; to Matthew's call; to the quotation of a text from Isaiah, which is found in a psalm ascribed to Asaph; to the calling of the lake of Tiberias a sea; to the expression in St. Matthew, 'the abomination of desolation'; to the variation in Matthew and Mark upon the text 'the voice of one crying in the wilderness,' Matthew citing it from Isaiah, Mark from the Prophets; to John's application of the term 'Word'; to Christ's change of intention about going up to the Feast of Tabernacles (John 7:8); to the judgment denounced by St. Peter upon Ananias and Sapphira, which he calls an imprecation of death. . . . The prophecy of Daniel he attacked upon this very ground of spuriousness, insisting that it was written after the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, and maintains his charge of forgery, by some, far-fetched indeed, but very subtle criticisms." (W. Paley, *A View of the Evidences of Christianity*, pp. 169, 171.)

treated to an exposition of the doctrine of inspiration which, carried to a logical conclusion, might easily lead its author to a view not far short of that held by the most liberal theologians of the day." When we read the *Lutheran Church Quarterly*, Oct. 1940 (see page 257 above), we could not help thinking of the argumentations employed by the old rationalists.

It is a sad spectacle. Christian theologians using the same methods as pronounced enemies of the Church—no, not the same methods! "There is a startling contrast between the former methods and those of today. The assault is now from within the gates: open warfare has given way to strategy. The Trojan horse has been wheeled within the walls of the Church itself, where a body of militant critics have been attempting to draw the bolts of the citadel." (Burrell, *op. cit.*, p. 184.)<sup>41)</sup>

Professor Laetsch asks: "Is that honest?" R. Ingersoll asked the same question. "I tell all the churches to drive all such men out, and when he" (a certain professor) "comes, I want him to state just what he thinks. . . . I want him to tell whether he considers the story about the bears a poem or not, whether it is inspired. . . . I had not the remotest idea that the most learned clergymen in Chicago would substantially agree with me—in public. I have read their replies and will now ask them a few questions. Do you believe in the stories of the Bible about Jael and of the sun standing still. . . ? Answer [Ingersoll now quotes one of them]: 'They may be legends, myths, poems, or what they will, but they are not the Word of God.'" And so it goes on, from page 356 to page 426, showing that the Liberals teach what Ingersoll teaches and still remain in the Christian Church.

Do we, then, classify the moderns as infidels and agnostics? We do not. The Liberals believe in God and the conservatives believe in Jesus Christ. But we do say that in this campaign they are fighting shoulder to shoulder with the unbelievers. And we say another thing. They cut a sorry figure when their unbelieving comrades examine them on the consistency of their position. Ingersoll might ask them whether they believe in God and then declare: You have a queer God, who set out to give us revelation and was unable to keep it free from errors.—Do you believe in Jesus Christ, true God? Then why do you not believe Him when he says that "Scripture cannot be broken," and how can you charge Him with sanctioning those erroneous books of the Old Testament?

41) See CONC. THEOL. MONTHLY, current volume, page 396: "Ingersoll, openly professed his agnosticism; modern unbelief chooses to call itself a 'new meaningful way of interpreting old and familiar passages and stories.' Is that honest?"

Gaussen says this: "On hearing such objections, we feel ourselves . . . under the impression of sadness, sadness at seeing persons who acknowledge the Bible to be a revelation from God and not afraid, notwithstanding, to bring so hastily the most serious objections against it." (*Op. cit.*, p. 199.)

The moderns are not in good company. And they have to deny their own principles in employing the arguments of their companions. That is unworthy of the Christian.

There is one more point that needs to be emphasized. When the moderns invite us to underwrite their list of errors, they are asking us to charge our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ with error and to impeach His authority. That is asking too much of a Christian.

Jesus put His divine authority back of the Bible. He endorsed every statement made by the prophets and by the apostles when He solemnly declared: "The Scripture cannot be broken," John 10:35. He proclaims the absolute irrefragability, inerrancy, of this Book. He assures us that there is no error in the Old Testament, no error in the New Testament (Matt. 10:19 f.; Mark 13:11; Luke 21:14, 15).<sup>42)</sup> And just such portions of Scripture as have been put on the black list have been vouched for by Christ. Did Moses write the Pentateuch? "Moses wrote of Me," John 5:46. Is the creation story a myth and old wives' tale? Read Matt. 19:4. Is the story of the Flood history or mythology? Read Matt. 24:37 ff. Was Abraham a legendary figure? "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see My day," John 8:56. Is the story of Lot's wife true, and the story of Jonah in the whale's belly? Read Luke 17:32 and Matt. 12:40. Every story related in the Bible, every circumstance of it, and every single jot and tittle shall stand. Jesus guarantees the truth of it.<sup>43)</sup>

42) See P. Kretzmann, *The Foundations Must Stand*, p. 38 ff. *Proceedings*, Iowa Dist., 1891, p. 30 f.

43) M'Intosh: "The object and burden of this book is to show that the Bible is, and claims to be, true, trustworthy, and of divine authority, and that Christ endorses and solemnly seals this claim with His divine authority and declares most absolutely the inviolability, solidarity, and organic unity of all Scripture." "The modern distinction between what is true and what is false in the Word of God is unknown to writers of Scripture and would have shocked the apostles and prophets and most of all the Son of God Himself, who set His solemn seal to every jot and tittle of it." (*Op. cit.*, pp. 2, 432.) S. C. Ylvisaker: "This is not the place to show in detail that or how Christ has identified Himself with all doctrines contained in Scripture, with all facts of history, geography, and so forth, which are mentioned there, and with every word written there as being His very own. Who are we to question one word which He has made His own, when He has said: 'The Scripture cannot be broken'; 'till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the Law'?" (*Report of the 1940 Convention of the Norwegian Synod*, p. 21 f.)

And is His guarantee worth anything? The moderns actually insist on ruling out His authority. Whether they believe in the deity of Christ or not, they are saying with Voltaire that His testimony on this point is untrustworthy. They speak of "the exegetical mistakes" of Jesus. "They say that Jesus committed blunders when in Mark 2:26 He confused Abiathar with Ahimelech and in Matt. 23:35 Barachias with Jehoiada" (*Neue Luth. Kirchenz.*, April 15, 1901). Baumgaertel, in a letter to the *Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kirchenz.*, Nov. 12, 1926: "We know more concerning the origin of the Scriptures of Israel than the Jewish scribes and *Jesus, who got His knowledge of these matters from them.*" Jesus labored under certain limitations; for instance, He had the mistaken viewpoints of His day and age. Says C. H. Dodd: "We need not doubt that Jesus as He is represented shared the views of His contemporaries regarding the authorship of books in the Old Testament, or the phenomena of demon possessions — views which we could not accept without violence to our sense of truth." (*The Authority of the Bible*, p. 237.) Accordingly, "we no longer accept a saying as authoritative because it lies before us as a word of Jesus" (p. 233).<sup>44)</sup>

Jesus is divested of His authority also by those who would extenuate His mistakes on the basis of the *kenosis*. W. Sanday opens the discussion of this question with the statement: "The question involved is nothing less than the authority of our Lord Himself." Absolutely true. He then says: "I should be loath to believe that our Lord *accommodated* His language to current notions, knowing them to be false." That, of course, is an impossibility. But then Sanday states: "I prefer to think, as it has been happily worded, that 'He *condescended* not to know.'" (*The Oracles of God*, pp. 103, 111.) *The Luth. Church Quart.*, 1935, p. 255, also operates with this false *kenosis* and, in addition, with the accommodation theory: "Jesus apparently shared the conceptions of His day regarding these things. As far as His speech indicates, He thought as the people of His time thought. At least when He emptied Himself and took upon Himself the form of a man, He accommodated His speech and activity to the concepts of the world in which He lived." That will not do. Scripture, indeed, tells us that Christ did not know the time of the Judgment (Mark 13:32), but that is far from saying that He could *err* in His statements.

---

44) "The question being asked in a recent meeting of evangelical ministers: 'If Moses did not write the Pentateuch, why did Jesus say that he did?' a voice replied: 'Because He knew no better.'" (D. J. Burrell, *Why I Believe the Bible*, p. 116.) Burrell comments: "It is incredible, however, that such views should be entertained by any of the sincere followers of Christ."

Refraining from the full use of His omniscience does not imply the harboring of erroneous ideas. If Christ "condescended" to be subject to error, His authority is destroyed.<sup>45)</sup>

Whether the moderns say so in so many words, every one who underwrites the black-list says in effect that Christ was mistaken when He endorsed every word of Scripture. So this is the situation: Either there are errors in the Bible, or there are no errors in the Bible. And they who take the first alternative are confronted by another dilemma. They will have to say either that Jesus did not know that there were errors in the Bible or that He knew it but would not admit it. And whether they accept the first or the second alternative, they refused to accept Christ's endorsement of all Scripture as worthy of acceptance. They insist that, while they reject certain portions of Scripture as unacceptable, they do accept the teaching of Jesus, that being all that God requires. But, behold, they refuse to accept one of the basic teachings of Jesus — that concerning the inerrancy, absolute trustworthiness, and plenary inspiration of Scriptures.

And now they ask us to sign their round robin. Dr. Pieper tells them: "All objections to the divine inspiration and the inerrancy of the Bible are unworthy of a Christian because in that case fallible human judgment with respect to Scripture is exalted above the divine judgment of the infallible Christ, the Son of God." (*What Is Christianity?* p. 251.) R. Torrey tells them: "The Pentateuch is the very part of the Bible where the hottest fight has always been waged between those who believe the Bible to be the inerrant Word of God and those who think that much of it is only fable or 'folk-lore.' Here is where you find the two accounts of Creation,

---

45) They, too, destroy the authority of Jesus who assume that He *might have been mistaken* in some of His views and judgments. James Stalker does that. He subscribes to Tholuck's statement "Although we find in the sayings of Jesus which we possess no formal hermeneutic mistake, yet the impossibility of such cannot be asserted *a priori* any more than the impossibility of a grammatical blunder or a chronological slip." (*The Ethics of Jesus*, p. 277.) — Tholuck, by the way, belongs also in the first group. He held that Jesus labored under the prejudices of His day. "Tholuck, der die Rationalisten vielfach bekaempft hat, ist doch so weit gegangen, dass er sagt, Christus habe auch keine hoehere Erkenntnis gehabt, als er zu der damaligen Zeit bei der Stufe der Erkenntnis, die damals sich vorfand, haben konnte. Man traut seinen Augen kaum! . . . Christus ein gewoehnlicher Mensch, der nicht mehr wissen koenne als die uebrigen Menschen seiner Zeit! . . . Echt nestorianisch!" (*Proceedings, Iowa Dist.*, 1891, p. 29, quoting Walther). — So the possibility of error quickly turns into the actuality. But we cannot stand even for the "possibility." If, in pronouncing on the authorship of Moses or on any other matter, Jesus *might have been* mistaken, the truth of His judgment would have to be established by some other means. You or I would have to come to the help of Jesus. Is the Christian willing to play such a role?

about which so many superficial and ill-informed readers and teachers of the Bible gabble so much to their own satisfaction and so much to the disgust of all real students of the Bible. Here is where you have the story of the Fall. . . . And in Mark 7:13 our Lord calls the Pentateuch the 'Word of God' in so many words. And Matt. 5:18: 'One jot or one tittle.'" (*Op. cit.*, p. 15 ff.) Dr. Brooks reminds them of "the marvelous fact that those very passages that men are most apt to believe uninspired (Lot's wife, Sodom and Gomorrah, Jonah) are the ones which have received the sanction of Jesus Christ Himself" and tells them plainly: "It is nonsense to say: 'I believe Christ, but not those things.'" (See *Lehre und Wehre*, 57, p. 129.) They are asking too much of us. Can a Christian in his sober mind face Jesus as He endorses the Old Testament and tell Him: "You might be mistaken"? "Shall we side with the critics in opposition to the testimony given in the New Testament by the apostles and even by the Lord Jesus Himself? Were they so circumscribed by the ignorance of the age in which they lived that they did not know the Scriptures of their people as well as the critics do? Was Jesus? . . . This modern view of the Bible insists upon our acceptance of the Christ-dishonoring doctrine of the *kenosis*, vitally maiming our Lord's unique and perfect personality, making Him, as far as His knowledge is concerned, nothing more than a product of His time." (J. Bloore, *Alternative Views of the Bible*, pp. 60, 66.) God forbid that we should side with those who in order to be in harmony with pseudoscience put themselves out of harmony with Christ's sayings! It comes to this: "By these Scriptures Christ stands with a tremendous decisiveness. With them, in fact, as their Author, Fulfiller, and End, He identifies Himself. . . . Men cannot deny or reject them or their claim without denying or rejecting Him and His." (M'Intosh, *op. cit.*, p. 437. — Read, once more, the article in *Lehre und Wehre*, 69, p. 297: *Ein oeffentliches Bekenntnis zur Inspiration der Heiligen Schrift in Deutschland*.)<sup>46)</sup>

46) We need not point out that Christ not only endorsed all that the prophets and the apostles wrote, but that their words are the very words of Christ. Christ is "the Author of Scripture." To say that Scripture is God's Word is to say that it is Christ's Word. And St. Peter tells us plainly that the prophets spoke by "the Spirit of Christ, which was in them" (1 Pet. 1:11), and St. Paul, that "Christ speaketh in me" (2 Cor. 13:3). It is thus apparent that our present section is merely an emphatic reiteration of the statement that he who criticizes Scripture commits a *crimen laesae majestatis divinae*. He who says that Scripture has erred and that Scripture can err is saying that God has erred and can err. But we wanted to reiterate and emphasize that in this present section because it has pleased Christ and the Holy Ghost to do that very thing, to reiterate and emphasize it. When the Christian is tempted to tamper with Scripture, the realization that his Lord and Savior Jesus Christ has endorsed it generally and specifically adds weight to the warning: Do not lay unclean hands on this holy thing!

Men cannot deny the claims of Scripture without denying Christ, who endorsed these claims. We are not saying that all who hold that there are errors in the Bible are no longer Christians. Any Christian, as the *Proceedings of the Synodical Conference* of 1902 set forth, may be assailed by doubts on this matter when he reads Scripture or the dissertations of its critics. There are good Lutheran Christians, pastors and laymen, who, though they are convinced in their hearts that Scripture cannot contradict itself, frequently find themselves grappling with the thought that Scripture does contradict itself. (Pp. 21-25.) And on page 20 the old theologian Andreas Althammer is quoted: "Es gibt freilich einige fromme ehrliche Leute, die aus Unwissenheit und Einfalt die Schrift fuer selbstwidersprechend halten." Even great theologians sometimes get befuddled.<sup>47)</sup> Dr. Pieper mentions in this connection even the denial of the Vicarious Satisfaction. He states, first, that through the means of this doctrine the Holy Ghost enters into the heart, "who teaches men to recognize as His Word the Word He spoke through the prophets and apostles." And then he says: "That we do not deny outright, in every case, that he can have the Christian faith who in the security of his lecture-room or in his 'scientific' writings criticizes the *satisfactio vicaria* is due to the fact that we are willing to account for it on the basis of a 'double bookkeeping' or inconsistency, according to which a person does not believe in his heart and before God what he champions in *disputationibus*, as Luther and Chemnitz put it." (*Christl. Dog. I*, p. 364.)

However, "all such theological thoughts lie outside of the Christian sphere." (Pieper, *loc. cit.*) What we do say is that those Christians — laymen, pastors, professors — who find mistakes in

---

47) We find a case in point in W. Elerts latest book, *Der Christliche Glaube*. Discussing the teaching of the old dogmaticians on Inspiration, he uses, on page 209, the phrase: "Der tiefere Grund dieser *Irrlehre*," referring to the statement of Quenstedt that Inspiration covers also those things which were already known to the holy writers. And then he says: "Wenn manche Dogmatiker . . . folgerten, dass der schreibende Mensch auch an der Bildung des Wortlautes keinen eigenen Anteil mehr habe, so grenzt das an Gotteslaesterung. Denn wie will man den Heiligen Geist dafuer verantwortlich machen, dass Paulus nicht mehr weiss, ob er ausser der Hausgemeinschaft des Stephanus in Korinth noch einen andern getauft hat (1 Kor. 1:16)." To be sure, it would be blasphemy to ascribe Paul's failure to remember certain data to the Holy Ghost. But Dr. Elert has got things badly mixed up here. All that the old dogmaticians — and we — say on this point is that the Holy Ghost caused Paul to set down this statement and supplied the words, too. — We set down this case in order to show that rejection of Verbal Inspiration is not necessarily due to unbelief, but may arise from misconception. Yes, a man may even know what Verbal Inspiration is and reject it without realizing what bearing this has on the fundamental question of the authority of Scripture; in that case he certainly could not be charged with *harboring* a fundamental error.

the Bible and for that reason reject Verbal Inspiration are not thinking Christian thoughts. They are thoughts inspired and uttered by the Old Adam. It is the Christian's duty to suppress such thoughts. It should shock him to find them arising in his mind, just, to quote M'Intosh once more, "as the modern distinction between what is true and what is false in the Word of God would have shocked the Son of God Himself, who set His solemn seal to every jot and tittle of it." We deny Him when we make this distinction; and what would the outcome be if one knowingly and persistently denied a word of Christ?<sup>48)</sup>

There is another reason why the Christian abominates the teaching of the erroneousness and errancy of the Bible. This teaching endangers the faith of the individual believer and causes untold harm to the Church.<sup>49)</sup>

When the Lutheran professors Volck and Muehlau began their campaign against the inerrancy of the Bible in 1884, it "confused and saddened many in Dorpat. A lady said with tears in her eyes: 'I can no longer read the Bible.'" (See *Lehre und Wehre*, 1886, p. 2.) It is a stubborn fact that, when you persuade a person to believe that there are errors in the Bible, you have filled him with distrust of the Bible. For what H. L. Mencken, who knows little of the Bible but is very bright intellectually, has said: "If the Bible is true, then it is true from cover to cover. . . . Dr. Machen's position is completely impregnable," is absolutely true. (See *Lutheran Sentinel*, Feb. 13, 1939.) It is absolutely true, therefore, what the Liberal D. Schenkel said: "If error is admitted at one point, it is admissible at all points." (See Rohnert, *Dogmatik*, p. 73.) It is absolutely true, therefore, what the scoffer Paine said: "If Matthew and Luke cannot be believed in their account of

---

48) On this subject Bishop Charles Gore writes: "I am writing in full recognition of the fact that the leaders of criticism, especially on the Continent, have been very frequently rationalists, by which is meant men to whom the idea of the supernatural and the miraculous is intolerable. This sort of rationalism is, of course, incompatible with Christian faith. But many of the 'critics,' and especially those in Great Britain, have been devout believers; and their motive in maintaining 'critical conclusions' has been the conviction that such conclusions are really scientific and that it is disastrous to set religion in antagonism to science or to seek to shackle science, which is bound to be free. I am writing also in full recognition of the fact that almost every science 'sows its wild oats.'" (*The Doctrine of the Infallible Book*, p. 8 f.) Dr. Gore deals too gently with the Christian who is convinced that there are mistakes in the Bible. Such a theologian must be told that his conviction is not befitting a Christian. No Christian theologian is permitted to cultivate "wild oats" on the holy ground of the Bible.

49) We shall treat this matter very briefly at the present time. After we have discussed two further objections to Verbal Inspiration ("the ethical blemishes of the Bible" and "the trivialities"), we shall go into details.

Christ's natural genealogy, how are we to believe them when they tell us He was the Son of God?" Get people to believe that these genealogies are contradictory and unreliable, and you have put them on the road to disaster. "Ein frommer Laie," said Althammer, "muesste irre werden an der Schrift. Waere wirklich ein Widerspruch, wie koennte ein Leser der Schrift zu einer Ueberzeugung kommen, was darin fest und gewiss sein soll?" (See *Proceedings, Syn. Conf., 1902*, p. 20.) There are countless numbers whose faith has been shaken by the preachers of Bible errancy, and but for the grace of God countless numbers would have been lost to the Church and — heaven.

It does not help matters that they have words of praise for the Bible and call the untrue portions "holy ground" (Dr. Fosdick, *The Modern Use*, p. 52), "stories which because of their beauty and intrinsic worth should stand" (Dr. Nolde, *Luth. Church Quart.*, 1939, p. 301). Nor is the situation bettered by the claim that, if only the moral and religious truths of the Bible are true, all is well. The stubborn fact remains that "we would lose confidence in Scripture if we found that Scripture actually contains *falsa* and *errata*" (Stoeckhardt, *Lehre und Wehre*, 1886, p. 314). And Schenkel, Mencken, and Paine agree with Stoeckhardt. Luther: "Dess wird mich (achte auch wohl, auch keinen vernuenftigen Menschen) niemand bereden ewiglich, dass ein Mensch (so er anders ein Mensch ist, der bei Vernunft ist) sollt mit Ernst glauben koennen einem Buche oder Schrift, davon er gewiss waere, dass ein Teil (schweige denn drei Teile) erlogen waere, dazu nicht wissen muesste, welches unterschiedlich wahr oder nicht wahr waere." (XX:2275.) Luther is speaking of the Koran. It would apply to the Bible, too, if the moderns had their way.

They say "the claim that the Scriptures are a perfect whole has wrought more mental distress and created more skepticism than any other dogma of Christian or Jewish theology." Under such preaching "poor souls pass off into the outer darkness" (see page 262 above). What actually happens is that the dogma of the errancy of Scripture is raising distressing doubts in the minds of the good Christians, is undermining the only foundation of faith (Walther: "Mit der Behauptung, dass dem goettlichen Inhalt der Heiligen Schrift auch Irriges, Menschliches eingestreut ist, wird nicht nur dieser Teil, sondern die ganze Heilige Schrift wankend und schwankend gemacht" [see *Lehre und Wehre*, 1911, p. 156]), and strengthens the infidel in his unbelief. No man ever lost his faith because of anything that the Bible says; the Holy Ghost takes care of that. But men have lost their faith because of the lie — which under the influence of Satan they believed — that the Holy Scriptures are untrustworthy. For the passing off of these

poor souls into the outer darkness the preachers of the errancy of Scripture are responsible.

This teaching is an evil and malignant thing. We say with Dr. W. Dau: "We deplore and denounce the open and the covert attempts which are being made by misguided men, to question or to deny the plenary or verbal theopneusty of the Bible or of parts of it. We abhor and abominate the irreverent schemes which unwise learned men have invented for producing a Bible which in their opinion will suit men better than the Bible of the prophets, evangelists, and apostles. We are indignant at the presumption of men who would have us rise mornings and inquire: 'What is the Bible today? How much . . . is still left of the dear old book?' We consider all these efforts abortive, futile, and doomed to utter failure. The last resting-place for all such dreams will be amid the spiritual and moral wreckage and *débris* which since time immemorial is the goal of rationalism." (From an address on the "Inerrancy of Scripture.")

TH. ENGELDER

(To be continued)

---

### Some Notes on the Life and Works of Catherine Winkworth

Essay read before the Northwest Pastoral Conference of the Norwegian Synod of the American Ev. Luth. Church, November 12, 1940

The change in the wording of my topic I ask you not to take amiss. To treat the "Life and Works of Catherine Winkworth" in one conference paper would demand more time than you would wish to devote to this topic and would tax too greatly the research facilities which I have had at hand. I have called this paper "Some Notes on the Life and Works of Catherine Winkworth" because of the unevenness and lack of balance which the subsequent pages will display, greater emphasis being placed on one or two topics than upon others. I had to do so partly because of the materials which were available to me, partly because I believed that those phases of her life and works which I have treated would be of grater interest to you than others.

While short biographical notices concerning Catherine Winkworth are numerous, only one seems to me to be of outstanding worth, that by Miss Elizabeth Lee in the *Dictionary of National Biography*.<sup>1)</sup> The closest approach to a full-length biography is found in *Memorials of Two Sisters: Susanna and Catherine Wink-*

---

1) Vol. LXII, London, 1900, pp. 194-5.

worth, edited by their niece, Margaret J. Shaen.<sup>2)</sup> The first eight chapters of this book are in narrative form, told by Susanna Winkworth, bringing the story down to the year 1859. This section is the better of the two parts, containing more details and giving a better selection of facts than the second part. The book is not a continuous narrative; it is rather a collection of letters strung together to form some sort of continuity — source material, it is true, for the biographer, but limited in its value for a thorough-going discussion of the life and works of Catherine Winkworth. By and large, it was this volume that was used in the preparation of these notes.

A memorial tablet erected to Catherine Winkworth in Bristol, England, briefly summarizes her life for us. It reads:

"In memory of Catherine Winkworth, who, in her *Lyra Germanica*, rendered into English verse the treasures of German sacred poetry, opened a new source of light, consolation, and strength in many thousand homes. Her works reveal a clear and harmonious intellect, a gift of true poetic insight and expression, and the firm Christian faith which was the mainspring of a life rich in tender and affectionate ministration and fruitful in various fields of active service. Her loss is mourned by all who shared her labor and by the many friends whom death has bereft of her rare sympathy and her unflinching help in every time of need. To commemorate her work and to perpetuate her efforts for the better education of women, a scholarship, bearing her name, has been founded in University College, Bristol, by friends who now dedicate this tablet to her memory."<sup>3)</sup>

From this we can see that her work was concerned mainly with the translation of German hymns and with education for women. It is in the former that we are interested, but in order to understand this the better, let us first learn something about her life.

Catherine Winkworth was born in London on the 13th of September, 1827. She died at the age of fifty on the 1st of July, 1878, in Monnetier (near Geneva), in Savoy, of heart disease and was buried there "in the corner of the churchyard set aside for Protestants."<sup>4)</sup> She was the fourth daughter of Henry Winkworth, a silk merchant and manufacturer.<sup>5)</sup> Her grandfather was William Winkworth, a clergyman, who belonged to "the then unpopular

2) London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1906, XV and 341 pages. Hereafter cited as *Memorials*. Available to me through the courtesy of the Library of Congress.

3) *Memorials*, p. 330.

4) *Op. cit.*, p. 329. P. 1 gives the exact place of her birth as No. 20 Ely Place, Holborn, England.

5) Miss Lee, in *D. N. B.*, LXII, p. 194, calls him a silk "merchant"; Susanna, in *Memorials*, l. c., calls him a silk "manufacturer." It is probable that he was both.

Evangelical party."<sup>6</sup>) Both parents came from religious homes, and both seem to have been very devout. Susanna, one of Catherine's elder sisters, says:

"Our mother's family was also actively concerned with the great revival which at that time concentrated the best religious life of the nation."<sup>7</sup>)

Naturally, religious instruction of the children was carried on in this home. We are not surprised to learn from Susanna:

"... our childhood was passed in the warmest atmosphere of Evangelical devotion, and our early heroes were all great missionaries and preachers."<sup>8</sup>)

We should like to know specifically what passed for religion and what was taught in this home. We know that Catherine early in life was taught Watt's *Catechism*.

"The doctrines we were taught," says her sister, "were those of the Calvinistic Evangelical school of Newton, Romaine, Toplady, etc., but in my mother's teachings the love of God was so brought out as almost to conceal with its brightness the sterner aspects of the creed to which she, too, subscribed."<sup>9</sup>)

This early religious atmosphere and the training which she received from her mother left an indelible stamp on Catherine. All her life she was more Evangelical than Anglican or Lutheran, a fact betrayed by the choice of hymns which she translated.<sup>10</sup>)

Catherine is described to us as a "delicate child," who matured late, precocious, gentle, obedient, intelligent, — she learned to read before the age of four, — with "thick, straight, dark-brown hair" and "very large, bright, dark eyes" ("her chief beauty").<sup>11</sup>) She was very ill between her tenth and twelfth year and again between her twentieth and twenty-second year.<sup>12</sup>) This fact may help to account in part for the fact that she was drawn to the hymns of Paul Gerhardt.<sup>13</sup>) Then, too, she lost her mother when she was only thirteen years of age.<sup>14</sup>) Her father married again four years later.<sup>15</sup>) Her adolescent years, we see, were filled with emotional problems of more than usual severity. During just these years, in the summer of 1845, she went to Dresden, Germany,<sup>16</sup>) there to live with an aunt,<sup>17</sup>) returning to England in July of the following

6) *Op. cit.*, l. c.

8) *Op. cit.*, p. 6.

7) *Op. cit.*, p. 2.

9) *Op. cit.*, p. 8 f.

10) An examination of her translations reveals that she favored those hymns which spoke of God's love and breathed comfort and trust in God. She did not translate many hymns of a purely doctrinal character.

11) *Memorials*, pp. 7, 8.

12) *Op. cit.*, p. 28.

13) *Vide infra*, p. 14.

14) *Memorials*, p. 12. Her mother died on April 21, 1841.

15) *Op. cit.*, p. 14.

16) *Op. cit.*, p. 16.

17) *D. N. B.*, LXII, p. 194.

year (1846).<sup>18)</sup> We are told that in the "*Sturm-und-Drang-Periode*" of her life she turned to Goethe as her chief guide."<sup>19)</sup> All these circumstances must be taken into consideration in gaging the influences which were active in her life, as they left an imprint on the character of her later work.

There were yet other influences which must be mentioned, the influence of her teachers. One of them was the philosopher James Martineau, who taught both Susanna and Catherine logic and rhetoric. Of him Susanna says that he "formed a very important and beneficial era in the development of our intellectual and spiritual life"<sup>20)</sup> and that his "teaching had fixed for her [Catherine] the intellectual foundations of faith."<sup>21)</sup> Catherine also took lessons in German<sup>22)</sup> and in Greek from William Gaskell, who also guided her into a "wide and thorough knowledge of English literature and her keen appreciation of style."<sup>23)</sup> The wife of this William Gaskell was a literary figure of some prominence, through whom the two sisters learned to know many of the important writers of that day.<sup>24)</sup> Catherine did not learn much Greek and knew no Latin.<sup>25)</sup> She was at home in Italian and in German. Her stay in Germany, when she was eighteen years of age (1845—1846), where she also studied music, perfected her knowledge of German;<sup>26)</sup> she had come in contact with German and moved in a circle of German merchants in Manchester before her year in Germany.<sup>27)</sup>

18) *Memorials*, l. c. 19) *Op. cit.*, p. 20. 20) *Op. cit.*, p. 20.

21) *Op. cit.*, p. 21. — James Martineau was a Unitarian philosopher of the last century (1810—1900). "His philosophy . . . was recently religious philosophy; individual freedom and the being and presence of God were his fundamental certainties. . . . In a series of essays he showed his power as a critic of materialism and naturalism, . . . and he showed no lack of power or effectiveness in dealing with the claims of the philosophy of evolution." (W. R. Sorley, "Philosophers," chap. I of Vol. XIV of *The Cambridge History of English Literature*, edited by A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller, New York, 1933, p. 29 f.) "In earlier life Martineau had adopted the determinist and utilitarian theories of morals, but he proved their effective critic in his octogenarian volume, *Types of Ethical Theory* (1885). Three years later he vindicated theistic belief in *A Study of Religion*." F. E. Hutchison, "The Growth of Liberal Theology," chap. XIII, in Vol. XII of the *Cambridge History of English Literature*, ed. by Ward and Waller, p. 330.

22) *Memorials*, p. 119.

23) *Op. cit.*, p. 23. Gaskell was a Unitarian; he is described to us as an "accomplished scholar." (*Cambr. Hist. of Engl. Lit.*, XIII, 413.) For Mrs. Gaskell cf. *op. cit.*, XIII, pp. 411—423. She was a writer of social novels.

24) *Memorials*, p. 25. 25) *Op. cit.*, p. 60. Cf. also p. 157.

26) *Op. cit.*, p. 15. Susanna says that when Catherine came to Germany, she "laid aside her Italian, of which she had now a very thorough knowledge, . . . took lessons in German and music."

27) *Op. cit.*, p. 26.

After her return from Germany, Catherine was sick for a period of two years.<sup>28)</sup> She was now, after her recovery, twenty-two years of age and probably felt that she ought to find some means of earning her own livelihood. At least her sister, Susanna, even earlier, was concerned with this problem, for she wrote to Emily (a third sister):

"You know as well as I do that beside the uncertainties of business, etc., if anything happened to Papa now, we are, according to present arrangements, not *adequately* provided for, and he knows it, too; so it is but common justice to put into my hands the means of providing myself."<sup>29)</sup>

Susanna had become interested in translating a life of Niebuhr early in 1849 "with a view," she says, "to gaining some money of my own by publishing."<sup>30)</sup> She spent almost a year in Bonn (August, 1850, to May, 1851), working on the *Life of Niebuhr*.<sup>31)</sup> At home, in Manchester, Catherine gave her help on this project,<sup>32)</sup> and it is interesting to note that they would read their translations to each other for correction.<sup>33)</sup>

This endeavor, coming as it did just at this time and under those circumstances, was a decisive factor in the life of Catherine Winkworth. She, too, began translating from the German. In 1853 she was working on the translation of *Perthes' Leben*, but another translation was announced.<sup>34)</sup> It would seem from this that Catherine, too, had determined that translating from the German for publication would be a good means of earning her own livelihood.

Susanna's work on the life of Niebuhr brought still another influence into the life of her sister Catherine, the influence of the Chevalier de Bunsen. Bunsen had asked Mrs. Austin to translate the life of Niebuhr, but providentially "she was otherwise engaged." Susanna Winkworth was suggested then as a possible translator by Mrs. Gaskell, the wife of the tutor of Susanna and Catherine Winkworth, who was well acquainted with Mrs. Austin.<sup>35)</sup> Susanna, as we have seen, was soon occupied with this work, but she had not yet met Bunsen. She met him for the first time in Manchester on Thursday, September 20, 1849. Writing to Emily and Catherine on that same day, she tells in detail about the meeting, beginning her letter with these words:

"Be it known unto you that I have this day seen, heard, talked, and shaken hands with — *Bunsen*, in *propria persona*, and that

28) *Vide supra*, p. 4, n. 12.

29) *Memorials*, p. 19. This letter is dated September 20, 1846.

30) *Op. cit.*, p. 32 f. Cf. also pp. 41, 44, 50.

31) *Op. cit.*, p. 66. Cf. also p. 155.

32) *Op. cit.*, p. 67. Cf. also pp. 72 and 73.

33) *Op. cit.*, p. 71.

34) *Op. cit.*, p. 94.

35) *Op. cit.*, p. 33.

our interview wound up with his asking me to come and see him when I came to London!!!! Hurrah! Oh, if you were but here to have a skip with me!"<sup>36)</sup>

We can understand her girlish excitement. It really was a big day in Susanna's life, and we might add, this day certainly had its repercussions in the life of her sister Catherine.

However, it was not until four years later that Catherine was introduced to Bunsen. The circumstances of this meeting are told us by Susanna:

"In April [1853] Catherine had paid a visit to Emily while I was at the Bunsens', and it must have been during this visit in London that Catherine was introduced to Bunsen. I had mentioned to him her translation of *Perthes' Leben* and consulted him about *Arndts Leben* and other books, in consequence of which he asked me to bring her to Carlton Terrace to talk the matter over with him. This must have been about the time, too, when Catherine was first introduced to the German hymns as well as to Tauler and the *Deutsche Theologie*, all of which interested her extremely, though the idea of her translating the *Lyra Germanica* was not conceived till the following year."<sup>37)</sup>

During the next months (in 1853) she tried her hand at desultory translation of hymns, "but was so far from having any definite plan of publishing them that she was still looking for some book to translate, in which case she would give them up."<sup>38)</sup> "I have been trying to translate some German hymns that Susie and I are fond of," she writes to Emily, "and don't succeed very well, but I like doing it."<sup>39)</sup>

Where did the idea of the *Lyra Germanica* come from? Let us permit Susanna to tell us the story of the genesis of this work.

"We now come to what was the turning-point in my sister's life," she says, namely, the production of the *Lyra Germanica*. She was, as we have seen, much delighted with the *Theologia Germanica* and afterwards with Tauler. I had intended to arrange a series of Tauler's sermons according to the ecclesiastical year, and I think it must have been in the summer of 1854 that I suggested she should translate a companion volume of sacred poetry since she had always succeeded well with the translations from the German poetry which Mr. Gaskell required of his pupils. She replied that that was quite beyond her powers; but when at Heidelberg I imparted my idea to Bunsen, who strongly approved of it and afterwards wrote to her on the subject, . . . I think that the letter of Bunsen's to which I had alluded brought her floating ideas to the crystallizing point."<sup>40)</sup>

I wish I had this letter written by Bunsen to Catherine, but I have not been able to uncover it. It would seem that it would

36) *Op. cit.*, pp. 49, 50.

37) *Op. cit.*, p. 96.

38) *Op. cit.*, p. 119.

39) *Op. cit.*, p. 120. This letter is dated September 13, 1854.

40) *Op. cit.*, p. 119.

be invaluable in determining just what considerations led Catherine to her great work. But, then, this letter was not the only means by which Bunsen exerted his influence on Catherine. Susanna gives us another indication of the baron's influence on her sister. She tells us that Bunsen had made a present of his *Andachtsbuch* to Catherine and that it was by means of this book that Catherine "had first become acquainted with the treasures of German hymnology" and that it was through Bunsen's "persuasion and encouragement she had been stimulated to attempt to introduce them to the English public."<sup>41)</sup>

In the preface of her *Lyra Germanica*, which was dedicated "to His Excellency the Chevalier Bunsen, etc., etc., etc.,"<sup>42)</sup> Catherine tells us:

"The following hymns are selected from the Chevalier Bunsen's 'Versuch eines allgemeinen Gesang-und Gebetbuchs,' published in 1833. From the large number there given, about nine hundred, little more than one hundred have been chosen."<sup>43)</sup>

This is conclusive evidence, I believe, that Bunsen deserves much credit for setting Catherine's feet on the path of hymn-translation. Her native talent, no doubt, together with the training which she had received particularly from her mother and Mr. Gaskell, enabled her to respond to the encouragement of others. Her sorrows and trials made her receptive to the messages of many of the hymns. How much credit shall we assign to Susanna for the suggestions and encouragement which she gave? Susanna tells the story and probably minimized the part she played in influencing her sister. So, whether Susanna or Bunsen should receive the greater credit, I cannot tell. It may be noted, too, that the literary climate of the time favored translations. Carlyle's influence was still felt; Rossetti was active. Russell, Massie, Edward Caswell, Mercer, Chandler, Buckoll, Neale, Miss Frances Cox,

41) *Op. cit.*, p. 129. — It seems odd to me that so little reference is made to Catherine Winkworth in *The Life and Letters of Frances Baroness Bunsen* by Augustus J. C. Hare (two volumes complete in one, New York: George Routledge and Sons and Anson. D. F. Rudolph Co. No date. The Minneapolis Public Library copy, acquisitioned on October 4, 1895, was used). One footnote, p. 251 n, tells us that the *Theologia Germanica* was later translated by Catherine Winkworth, which is incorrect, since Susanna translated it. Cf. *Memorials*, p. 333; D. N. B. LXII, 195. The only other reference to Catherine Winkworth in Hare, *op. cit.*, is in a letter written on July 9, 1858. The baroness, writing to her daughter, Mary, says, "Miss Winkworth is come" and then goes on to tell why Florence Nightingale did not come.

42) *Lyra Germanica*. Hymns for the Sundays and Chief Festivals of the Christian Year. Translated from the German by Catherine Winkworth. New York: Thomas N. Stanford, 1856, p. V. This copy, the earliest edition I have seen, was used through the courtesy of the Rev. Norman A. Madson of Princeton, Minn.

43) *Op. cit.*, p. VII.

Kelly, Miss Jane Borthwick, and Mrs. Sarah Findlater were active as translators of German, Latin, or even Greek hymns in the middle and third quarter of the nineteenth century,<sup>44</sup> the Victorian Age, which looked to the Continent for much of its culture and learning. Then, too, Catherine needed an income. It seems almost "natural" that she should be a translator of German hymns.

We may pause at this point to ask, Who was Bunsen? particularly since his influence on Catherine Winkworth continued to influence her work.

Christian Charles Josias, Baron von Bunsen, was the son of an obscure German family of Corbach, of captivating personality, educated at Marburg and Oettingen, recipient of an honorary Doctor's degree from Jena at the age of twenty-one, philologist, philosopher, theologian, historian, diplomat, and author. He was interested in union, the union of the German states, the Evangelical Union, the union of Protestantism in Palestine. He served as representative at the Vatican and was the Prussian ambassador in England between 1842 and 1854. The later years of his life — he died in 1860 — were spent in literary labors.

"To restore to the Bible that place in the households of his country which it had possessed in the first generations after the Reformation, to revive the knowledge and love of the German reformers' hymns, to give his people such a Book of Common Prayer, resting upon the liturgies of all Christian ages as would help congregations in 'presenting themselves a living sacrifice,' to rekindle the fervor of other days for works of self-devotion and charity, to work out a Christian philosophy of history, — such were the purposes to which he devoted the happiest and best hours in each succeeding year."<sup>45</sup>

Among his writings are: *Bibelwerk*, *Epistles of St. Ignatius*, *On All the Heresies by Hippolytus*, an article on Martin Luther (described as "one of the finest biographies of the great Reformer") in the eighth edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, *Signs of the Times*, *Egypt's Place in Universal History*, his *Andachtsbuch*

44) David R. Breed, *The History and Use of Hymns and Hymn Tunes*, Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1903, p. 230. — H. Augustine Smith, *Lyric Religion: The Romance of Immortal Hymns*, New York and London: The Century Co., 1931, p. 452. — L. Fuerbringer, *Zur Geschichte des englischen Gesanges. Eine Konferenzarbeit, passim*. — John Julian (editor), *A Dictionary of Hymnology* setting forth the Origin and History of Christian Hymns of All Ages and Nations, with special reference to those contained in the hymn-books of English-speaking countries and now in common use, together with biographical and critical notices of their authors and translators, etc., New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1892, *passim*. — *The Cambridge History of English Literature*, edited by Ward and Waller, especially Vols. XII, XIII, and XIV, *passim*. — T. B. Hewitt, *Paul Gerhardt as a Hymn-writer and His Influence on English Hymnody*. New Haven, 1918, pp. 32-3.

45) *Enc. Brit.*, 9th ed. (1890), IV, 523.

(already mentioned), *Outlines of Universal History as Applied to Language and Religion*, and his *God in History*.<sup>46)</sup>

Though not germane to our topic, I cannot refrain from adding a brief word about his philosophy of history. "The progress of mankind, he contends, marches parallel to the conception of God formed within each nation by the highest exponent of its thought." His desire, aim, chief purpose, is "to trace the firm path of God through the stream of ages."<sup>47)</sup>

His *Gott in der Geschichte* was translated into English by Susanna Winkworth;<sup>48)</sup> the translation of his *Zeichen der Zeit* is the joint work of Susanna and Catherine, though published as a translation by Susanna.<sup>49)</sup> It was in 1855 and 1856, immediately after the appearance of the *Lyra Germanica*, that the sisters were busily engaged in this work.

And so our excursus has brought us back to the *Lyra Germanica*, published in 1855.<sup>50)</sup> Susanna, who had urged the work, had expected the hymns to be translated by Christmas, 1854,<sup>51)</sup> but in March, 1855, Catherine had completed only sixty of the hundred she wished to translate and was hoping to finish the remainder by the middle of May. "I am doing them at the rate of one a day when I can get a day to myself," she writes.<sup>52)</sup> The first edition of the *Lyra Germanica* was published in August (1855) and was sold out by October; so Catherine was soon busy correcting proof

46) My sketch of Bunsen has been drawn from the *Enc. Brit.*, 9th ed., IV, 521—525. I have consulted *A Memoir of Baron Bunsen* by Frances Bunsen, his wife. Leopold von Ranke, the great historian, edited a collection of his letters, chiefly his correspondence with Friedrich Wilhelm IV while Bunsen was ambassador in London.

47) *Enc. Brit.*, 9th ed., IV, 525.

48) *Memorials*, pp. 261, 335.

49) *Op. cit.*, p. 135, Catherine speaks of "our joint translation of Bunsen's *Signs of Our Times*."—Catherine also writes to Emily: "Susie told you, of course, all her publishing affairs, and aren't you pleased that we are to get £150 for *Zeichen der Zeit*? It turns out, however, no easy matter to translate Bunsen, and I feel a little fearful whether I, unused to this style of translation, am equal to it. I have agreed to do whatever Susy sets me in that way, as if I am really to help her and all the responsibility is hers, it is but fair I should work under her orders." *Op. cit.*, pp. 132-3. Susanna writes: "In May [1856] the first volume of *Signs of the Times*, at which Catherine and I had been working together, was published, and Bunsen wrote of it: "I must particularly thank you for that excellent preface, which is not only perfect in itself, but just what I must have wished as a German and as a Prussian, because it says exactly what every good Englishman and Protestant should see and feel as well as every German. You have done a real service to a good cause as well as to myself." *Op. cit.*, p. 138.

50) *Op. cit.*, pp. 122, 129, 333. *Julian's Dictionary*, p. 1287. The date, 1853, given in the *D. N. B.*, LXII, p. 194, is incorrect.

51) *Memorials*, p. 124.

52) *Op. cit.*, p. 127.

for a second edition.<sup>53)</sup> Twenty-three editions of this book had been published by 1900.<sup>54)</sup>

The book met with immediate favor. Many quotations could be brought to show this; but we shall cite only the letter which Baron von Bunsen wrote to Catherine from Charlottenburg, on the 23d of September, 1855. He writes:

"*Mein Liebes Fraeulein Winkworth.* — Das Herz treibt mich, mit Ihnen Deutsch zu reden, da Sie mir meine deutschen Lieblingslieder, die heiligen Gesaenge meines Volkes, so herrlich verstanden und wiedergegeben haben. Ich danke Ihnen also *doppelt* fuer Ihre freundliche Zueignung; es ist mir eine wahre Ehre und Freude, meinen Namen mit einem so *gelungenen* Werke verbunden zu sehen. Meine Frau und Tochter teilen meine Bewunderung dafuer und gruessen Sie herzlich. Ich habe auch andere Beweise, wie sehr fromme englische Christenseelen sich daran erbauen als an einem Nationalwerke. Das Buch wird seinen Weg machen. Ihre *Vorerinnerungen* sind sehr zweckmaessig und klar. . . . Da haben Sie mein Angebind fuer eine zweite oder vierte oder zehnte Ausgabe! . . . Ihr aufrichtiger Freund. BUNSEN."<sup>55)</sup>

The *Lyra Germanica* is a collection of "hymns for the Sundays and chief festivals of the Christian year," as the subtitle of the work informs us. It also contains morning and evening hymns, hymns for the sick and the dying, and hymns for the burial of the dead. For the Sundays and festivals a verse from either the Gospel or the Epistle is cited, and then the hymn is given. *E. g.*, for Christmas Eve, Luke 2:10 is quoted, and then follows Luther's "Vom Himmel hoch" in her unexcelled translation.<sup>56)</sup>

Catherine Winkworth's judgment of Luther as a hymn-writer is interesting. She writes:

"Luther's hymns are wanting in harmony and correctness of meter to a degree which often makes them jarring to our modern ears, but they are always full of fire and strength, of clear Christian faith, and brave, joyful trust in God."<sup>57)</sup>

Paul Gerhardt was her favorite hymn-writer. Of him she said:

"He is without doubt the greatest of the German hymn-writers, possessing loftier poetical genius and a richer variety of thought and feeling than any other. . . . With him culminated the elder school of German sacred poetry, a school distinguished by its depth and simplicity. Most of its hymns are either written for the high festivals and services of the Church or are expressive of a simple Christian faith, ready to dare or suffer all things for God's sake."<sup>58)</sup>

Again:

"As a poet he undoubtedly holds the highest place among the hymn-writers of Germany. His hymns seem to be the spontaneous outpouring of a heart that overflows with love, trust, and praise; his language is simple and pure; if it has sometimes a

53) *Op. cit.*, p. 129; cf. p. 133.

54) *D. N. B.*, LXII, 194.

55) *Memorials*, p. 130.

56) *Lyra Germanica*, New York, 1856, p. 12 ff.

57) *Op. cit.*, p. X.

58) *Op. cit.*, p. XIII.

touch of homeliness, it has no vulgarism, (the only hymn which does not deserve this commendation is a translation from the Latin), and at times it rises to a beauty and grace which always gives the impression of being understudied, yet could hardly have been improved by art. His tenderness and fervor never degenerate into the sentimentality and petty conceits which were already becoming fashionable in his days; nor his penitence and sorrow into that morbid despondency which we find in Gryphius and for which the disappointments of his own life might have furnished some excuse. If he is not altogether free from the long-windedness and repetition which are the besetting sins of so many German writers, and especially hymn-writers, he at least more rarely succumbs to them; and in his days they were not considered a blemish."<sup>59</sup>

It seems to have been Gerhardt's faith in the love of God — as distinguished from God's redemptive grace — which drew Catherine Winkworth to this poet, not less than Gerhardt's poetical excellence.<sup>60</sup> This is shown, I believe, by a letter which she wrote to Richard Massie, the translator of *Luther's Spiritual Songs*:

"I admire and love Gerhardt's hymns so much that I am half unwilling to admit their defects; yet while many have marvelous dignity, force, and tender sweetness, others, it must be confessed, are curiously prolix and unpoetical. The latter were evidently written not from the impulse of some deep experience, but because he wanted a hymn of a certain class for the sake of instruction or some other extraneous purpose."<sup>61</sup>

What this "love of God" meant to Catherine — and that something different than it did to Gerhardt — we can see from the consolation which she gives to "a friend in ill health and mental difficulties."<sup>62</sup> She counsels this friend to strive against "self-engrossment and self-consciousness." "As God Himself is Love and all happiness is in Him," she says, "so there is no happiness for any of us, His creatures, except in living out of ourselves, which is the life of love."<sup>63</sup> And she ends this first letter:

"So it all comes to this: *the great help is the love of God, out of ourselves; and if we cannot rise to feeling love, one can do the works of love towards them, and God has so ordered that the feeling will certainly follow. But in all our religion we must not think chiefly of ourselves, of our sins even, or be always examining what our religion is doing to us, what its effect on our mind and feeling is. One must think of God, of His infinite, unspeakable goodness and patience and tenderness, till one can't help longing to make some*

59) Catherine Winkworth, *Christian Singers of Germany*. J. B. Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia. Macmillan & Co., publishers. No date. P. 209.

60) I have inferred this from the hymns which she translated and from the remark which she quotes from Gervinus. *Op. cit.*, p. 210.

61) *Memorials*, p. 180. The letter is dated June 11, 1858.

62) *Op. cit.*, pp. 246—251. These letters were written in June, 1867.

63) *Op. cit.*, p. 247.

return at least to show that one is thankful, by doing His will wherever one can see it. Then one is glad to do one's own little bit of His great battle with evil, whether it be in helping others or struggling with pain and weakness in one's self and turning it from a curse into a blessing."<sup>64</sup>

In the next letter she says:

"When we can once grasp the truth that our Father in heaven has cared so intensely for His children on earth (even when, too often, they did not care for Him) that He has interposed in their behalf in a way that seems only too good to be true and yet is absolutely true, a fact that has become the turning-point of history. For He sent His own Son, a very part of Himself, to live and die in human nature, so to show us, as no other means could, at once what God is towards us and what the ideal life for man and his true attitude towards God ought to be. When we have once learned to see this truth, we feel that our feet are on the rock, because the *fact* of what God has done for us and His great love to us is always there and does not shift with our variable feelings and moods."<sup>65</sup>

It is evident from this, I believe, that Catherine lacked a true understanding of the atoning work of Christ and of *sola gratia*. It becomes still more evident from a letter which she wrote to Edward Herfor in January, 1858:

"You seemed to me to hold that there is no salvation out of the Church; and it seems to me that the Bible teaches that there is no salvation out of Christ, which is not the same thing. For I believe that none are saved except by Him, but that some are saved by Him who have never known Him by name here. I believe that many a poor struggling soul among our neglected working-men, for instance, that has been blindly striving after a more honest and manly life, whose very honesty and manliness have been in part the cause of its fierce rebellion against the form of religion which is all it has known of Christianity, will find the veil drop from its eyes in the next world and see that in Christ was the noble manhood, the divine love and justice it has ignorantly, yet earnestly sought for here. We none of us see all the truth now; we shall all need a new enlightenment then."<sup>66</sup>

This denies Christianity and agrees with what she wrote in 1864:

"It seems to me that our *certainly* as to the ultimate facts of the universe or fundamental propositions of belief rests on a twofold foundation—our own consciousness and the external witness to that consciousness given by the external consciousness of the race and by the laws of the universe, so far as we know them."<sup>67</sup>

When she expatiates on this idea at some length,<sup>68</sup> she says, e. g.: "Courage, self-sacrifice, loyalty, love of family and country, are admired everywhere; treachery, cowardice, cruelty, are condemned."<sup>69</sup> Certainly she did not believe that the Bible, the written Word, was the sole revelation of God to man, but that

64) *Op. cit.*, p. 249.

65) *Op. cit.*, pp. 249, 250.

66) *Op. cit.*, p. 176.

67) *Op. cit.*, p. 232, written to "a friend."

68) *Op. cit.*, pp. 232—234.

69) *Op. cit.*, p. 234 f.

there is a revelation "by the Spirit of God to the spirit of each believer."<sup>70</sup> Nor did she believe in the Sacrament of Baptism as a means of grace. In November, 1852, she wrote to her sister Emily, asking if Emily would have her child baptized.

"But it seems to me," she says, "such a right and beautiful and appropriate thing, whether the apostles did it or not, to consecrate the little creature to God as soon as He has given it, and mark it with the sign of the faith in which it is to be brought up."<sup>71</sup>

Catherine, it must be remembered, was a member of the Anglican Church, unlike her sister Susanna, who was a Unitarian (at least up to the year 1874).<sup>72</sup> Her Anglicanism, however, was latitudinarian, liberal, rather than conservative, owing to her associates; for she tells us that she had been "brought much in contact with the extreme liberal party within the Church and Unitarians out of it; in fact," she says, "I may say that I know all the chief heretics in England, except . . . Mr. Jowett."<sup>73</sup>

Her views and notions, however, were not read into the hymns which she translated, for which we can thank God. The beautiful, orthodox Lutheran hymns are translated in all their orthodoxy and in much of their beauty. Catherine Winkworth rendered a great service thereby to the Lutheran Church in this country, particularly by the translations which appeared in the two series of the *Lyra Germanica*.

We have not yet mentioned the second series of translations, which she began soon after the publication of the first series.<sup>74</sup> This second series appeared in 1858 with the subtitle "The Christian Life."<sup>75</sup> I have not seen this book. In the following year (1859) *A Selection of Hymns from the Lyra Germanica* was published.<sup>76</sup> Nor have I seen this collection. An illustrated edition of the first series appeared in 1860,<sup>77</sup> and of the second, in 1867.<sup>78</sup>

70) *Op. cit.*, p. 241, in a letter written to the Bishop of Argyll (June, 1865).

71) *Op. cit.*, p. 92.

72) *Op. cit.*, pp. 148, 319. Cf. also pp. 311—319, 197, 148, 164 n.

73) *Op. cit.*, p. 239.

74) On September 5, 1856, she mentions in a letter that she is busy with her new series. *Op. cit.*, p. 157.

75) *Op. cit.*, p. 333. Published by Longmans.

76) *Op. cit.*, l. c. Likewise published by Longmans. The preface of this edition was written by Alexander Ewing, Bishop of Argyll.

77) She asked Ruskin to recommend an artist for this work. *Op. cit.*, p. 206. It was published "with about 225 illustrations from original drawings, engraved on wood under the superintendence of John Leighton, F.S.A." Published by Longmans, *op. cit.*, p. 333.

78) Published by Longmans "with about 200 illustrations by John Leighton, F.S.A., E. Armitage, A.R.A., and F. Madox Brown." *Op. cit.*, l. c. Twelve editions of the second series were published by 1900. D.N.B., LXII, 195.

But the *Chorale Book* was the work with which she showed the greatest concern during these years.<sup>79)</sup>

Again it was Bunsen's suggestion which led to the publication of the *Chorale Book for England*.<sup>80)</sup> The main problem was to find a musical editor for this work.<sup>81)</sup> Dr. Bennett of Cambridge, who had been recommended very highly to her, consented to serve in this capacity.<sup>82)</sup> Bunsen, however, recommended Otto Goldschmidt, a first-rate German musician; Bennett and Goldschmidt agreed to collaborate.<sup>83)</sup> The book appeared in 1862 under the following title:

*The Chorale Book for England; a complete Hymn Book for Public and Private Worship in accordance with the Services and Festivals of the Church of England; the Hymns, from the Lyra Germanica and other sources, translated from the German by Catherine Winkworth; the Tunes, from the sacred Music of the Lutheran, Latin, and other Churches, for four voices, with Historical Notes, &c., compiled and edited by William Sterndale Bennett, Professor of Music in the University of Cambridge, and by Otto Goldschmidt.*

By July 20, 1863, this work was in its third edition;<sup>84)</sup> a supplement appeared in 1865.<sup>85)</sup> I have not been able to examine this

79) Catherine contributed translations to various hymnals published at this time, e. g., the *Lyra Eucharistica* by Mr. Orby Shipley (whom she thought "extremely High Church" in his position on the Sacrament of the Altar). *Memorials*, p. 229 f. Cf. also pp. 135—137.

80) *Op. cit.*, p. 135; pp. 158, 159. Bunsen's letter, *ibidem*, pp. 138, 139, reads: "I mean to propose a plan to our dear Kate the idea of which has come to me through Neukomm's visit. As her really wonderful translations seem to promise to effect what hitherto has proved impossible, namely, to naturalize in England the German hymns, the most immortal literary fruit of the Reformation, it should be attempted to naturalize also its inseparable companion, the Latin and German chorale, but with due regard for the English element of congregational singing, the *Liederweise*; for such all really English melodies for their so-called psalms or hymns are. The hymns translated by her should be divided into two parts: the real *Kirchenlied* (hymn for public worship) and the *Andachtslied* (hymn for private devotions). The first must be sung as chorales; where the meter has been changed, the melody of the original must be adapted (which surely is possible?), or another melody must be substituted for it, which can easily be furnished from the store of 1,200 good chorales we possess. But with regard to the *Andachtslieder*, they must have a singable character, with a rhythmical swing, but really melodious and dignified. I have already a good number of such, and Neukomm is now composing twenty-five similar ones for the Evangelical community at Jerusalem. He would like this very autumn to compose those which are still wanting. Then an edition of the hymns would have to be issued with printed tunes for one voice, with accompaniment for organ or piano, which is quite feasible and inexpensive. The accompaniment must be so arranged that the notes would also serve for four singing parts. If it takes, which I am sure it would, an immense thing would be effected."

81) *Op. cit.*, pp. 179, 180.

82) *Op. cit.*, p. 193. Cf. pp. 208, 209, 222, 223, 224, 226, 334.

83) *Op. cit.*, pp. 208, 209. 84) *Op. cit.*, p. 230. 85) *D. N. B.*, LXII, 195.

work. For this reason, too, I can but mention ten other works, translations, with which Catherine Winkworth was engaged in the 1860's: *Life of Amelia Wilhelmina Sieveking*, which appeared in 1863,<sup>86)</sup> and the *Life of Pastor Fliedner*, the founder of the Kaiserswerth Sisterhood of Protestant Deaconesses, which came out in 1867.<sup>87)</sup>

These two works show us a change of direction in Catherine's interests. We may well ask, Did Catherine Winkworth feel some affinity for Amelia Sieveking? She writes of her *Life*:

"I think it is very full of instruction and interest, too. The two points that especially attracted me in it were, first, the progress of her mind from a dry, hard rationalism to that warm, vivid, rejoicing faith, so strikingly characteristic of her later life; and then the fact that a life under such disadvantageous circumstances—as a poor, proud, unattractive young woman, shut up in a dreary, narrow, formal little round of intercourse and occupation—should have unfolded itself into a career of such generous and joyful activity. Many of those who make so much noise about 'women's work' nowadays might learn, too, from her how much may be accomplished by quietly embracing any opportunity of usefulness opened to the mind and making no unnecessary stir about it."<sup>88)</sup>

To me this seems to be an important bit of self-revelation. I believe that Catherine, unconsciously, has found in Amelia Sieveking a picture of herself and what she would like to be. Disclaiming that she is a "women's rights" woman, she becomes interested in the welfare and education of women. Certainly she could not forget her first love, the religious poetry of Germany, nor would she neglect her debt of gratitude to Bunsen for encouraging her to publish the *Lyra Germanica*. This debt she discharged by publishing a collection of Bunsen's prayers in 1871, undertaken at the request of his widow.<sup>89)</sup> The former is evident from the publication of the *Christian Singers of Germany* in 1869, a historical account of the religious poetry of Germany.<sup>90)</sup> But the later years of her life were devoted to the education of women,

86) *Op. cit.*, l. c. Memorials, pp. 235, 228, 334.

87) *Op. cit.*, pp. 254, 256. D. N. B., LXII, 1. c.

88) *Memorials*, pp. 235, 236. In a letter to Richard Massie on February 28, 1864.

89) *Op. cit.*, p. 283. She had planned to translate a selection of Bunsen's prayers as early as 1859, p. 193. The first part of the published volume contains prayers for the family; the second part, prayers and meditations for private use, p. 335.

90) *Op. cit.*, pp. 255, 268—271, 335. D. N. B., LXII, 195. Miss Lee says that this work appeared in 1866 and 1869. I find no other evidence for the earlier date. The preface of the edition I have used is dated April, 1869.

particularly in connection with the "Clifton Association for the Higher Education of Women" and similar organizations.<sup>91)</sup>

But a few more words about her *Christian Singers of Germany*. The volume appeared in the *Sunday Library for Household Reading* which Macmillan & Co. was publishing. It was meant to be, and is, a popular account of the song heritage of Germany. The scope of her work, based almost entirely on secondary authorities (Wackernagel, Koch, Von Hagenbach, Corvinus, and Gustav Freitag),<sup>92)</sup> she delineates for us in the preface as follows:

"Such a work as the present cannot attempt more than an outline of a subject which is . . . linked, on the one side, to the general history and literature of Germany, while, on the other, it has a separate history of its own, full of minute and almost technical details. Only the principal schools and authors are described, and specimens are selected from their works; but other writers of secondary rank are mentioned to enable readers who may be inclined to do so to fill up the picture of any particular school or period more completely for themselves. The choice of the specimens has been determined partly by their intrinsic merits, partly by their novelty to the English public; hence nearly all the great classical hymns are named as illustrating the spirit of certain times; but they are not given in full, because they have been previously translated and are in many instances familiar to us already. A very few, which it was impossible to pass over, form the only exceptions to this rule."<sup>93)</sup>

In this book she discusses, for instance, Notker's *Sequences*, the *Heliand*, Otfried of Weissenburg, Esso of Babingberg, the German sequences ("Leisen"), the Minnesingers, Ulrich von Hutten, Luther, Jonas, Hans Sachs, Philip Nicolai, Paul Gerhardt, Zinzendorf, Klopstock.<sup>94)</sup> For the purpose for which it was written the book is eminently worth while and could well be studied by the average pastor with profit.

Much more could be said about the life and works of Catherine Winkworth. No attempt, for instance, has been made to discuss any one of her hymn translations in particular. Only a general overview, with some attention to a few details of her life and thought, has been attempted. Perhaps Catherine Winkworth ought to be known better within the Lutheran Church. Many of her hymns are known and used within our Lutheran circles. One Lutheran hymnal, published in Decorah, Iowa, in 1884, containing 150 hymns plus 10 doxologies, has fifty-four of Catherine Winkworth's translations (of these 15 are unaltered and

91) *Memorials*, pp. 193, 260, 261, 328, 332. D. N. B., LXII, 1. c., Julian, *op. cit.*, 1. c.

92) *Winkworth, Christian Singers of Germany*, p. VI.

93) *Op. cit.*, pp. III, IV.

94) *Op. cit.*, *passim*.

39 altered). *The Lutheran Hymnary* contains 67 of her translations. Miss Lee says of Miss Winkworth:

"Catherine Winkworth's translations of German hymns are widely used and have done more to influence the modern use in England of German hymns than any other version. The translations are always faithful and at the same time poetical."<sup>95</sup>

And Julian writes:

"Miss Winkworth, although not the earliest of modern translators from the German into English, is certainly the foremost in rank and popularity. Her translations are the most widely used of any from that language and have had more to do with the modern revival of the English use of German hymns than the versions of any other writer."<sup>96</sup>

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allibone, S. Austin, *A Critical Dictionary of English Literature and British and American Authors, living and deceased, from the earliest accounts to the latter half of the nineteenth century*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1891. Vol. III.
- Bease, Frederic, *Modern English Biographies*. Thuro: Netherton & Worth for the author. "280 copies only printed." 1901. Vol. III.
- Breed, David R., *The History and Use of Hymns and Hymn-Tunes*. Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1903. IX and 386 pages.
- Bunsen, Frances, *A Memoir of Baron Bunsen*. London.
- Duffield, Samuel W., *English Hymns: Their Authors and History*. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co. Copyright 1886. Tenth edition. VII and 675 pages.
- Hare, Augustus, J. C., *The Life and Letters of Frances Baroness Bunsen*. Two volumes complete in one. New York: George Routledge and Sons and Ancon. D. F. Randolph & Co. No date.
- Julian, John, *A Dictionary of Hymnology*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1892.
- Lee, Elizabeth, "Catherine Winkworth." *Dictionary of National Biography*. London, 1900. Vol. LXII.
- Shaon, Margaret J., *Memorials of Two Sisters: Susanna and Catherine Winkworth*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1908. XV and 341 pages.
- Hewitt, Theodore, E., *Paul Gerhardt as a Hymn Writer and His Influence on English Hymnody*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1918. XIV and 162 pages.
- Smith, H. Augustine, *Lyric Religion: The Romance of Immortal Hymns*. New York and London, The Century Co., 1931. XV and 517 pages.
- Ward and Waller, *Cambridge History of English Literature*. New York: The Macmillan Co., Cambridge, England: at the University Press, 1933. Vols. XII, XIII, and XIV.
- Winkworth, Catherine, *Lyra Germanica*, New York: Thomas N. Stanford, 1856.
- Winkworth, Catherine, *Christian Singers of Germany*. J. B. Lippincott and Co., Philadelphia. Macmillan and Co., publishers. XIV and 340 pages.

Mankato, Minn.

CARL S. MEYER

95) D. N. B., LXII, 195.

96) Julian, *op. cit.*, l. c.

## Studying Case Histories

### A New Approach to Self-Improvement in Ministering to the Individual

Ministering to a congregation is not only preaching. I entered the ministry laboring under the false impression that it is. Didn't all my friends urge me to study for the ministry because I had won the county oratorical contest two years in succession? Didn't I learn from the Apology itself that "there is nothing which holds people with the church more effectively than a good sermon"? Didn't Luther have so many hearers because he was a good preacher? I would develop my preaching and build up a congregation by "compelling them to come in" in that way.

I tried it and soon learned to know what it means to deliver a well-prepared and polished sermon to empty seats. Perhaps I needed more and better preparation, I thought. But I discovered that, the more time I spent on sermon-study, the less time was left for inviting prospects to church and the smaller my audience became. So I began to make more pastoral calls. But I often felt (as Kuhlmann has expressed it in *Watch Yourself Go By*) that I was a "merry-go-round pastor," getting off at the same place where I got on. That I needed more study of this phase of pastoral work was apparent. But where study? Books on the subject are few. To learn by experience is perhaps the best way, but "experience is a costly teacher." I feared it might cost a soul!

How about our pastoral conference? I thought. Why should we submit a sermon for criticism every month, always study ministering in public and never discuss our private ministry? Why should each of us endeavor to improve as a preacher and not as a *Seelsorger*? True, we did present cases of casuistry and discuss what to do in peculiar instances; but then we talked about general principles and not about detailed statements. We discussed unusual cases, not ordinary ones. What I wanted was practice in making calls on the individual who was in doubt, unbelief, perplexity, distress, or sickness,—practice where mistakes would not cost a soul! I wanted to learn from the brethren with experience and to have my mistakes pointed out. Social-service workers, lawyers, and others prepare for their professions by studying case histories. Why shouldn't the pastor do the same thing?

The conference agreed to study case histories every second month. We have done it for more than a year. It has proved very helpful to many of us. I have been requested repeatedly to write up the procedure and call it to the attention of other brethren. Hardly daring to believe that others could be so ill prepared for the pastoral ministry, I consent reluctantly. (This is no reflection

on the professors. They do a good piece of work at the seminary. But after we are in the field, we must develop farther.)

Somewhat fearfully I presented the first case history, laying myself wide open for criticism but visualizing the benefits which might come to the brethren if the custom spread throughout our Synod. I took a most ordinary case in order to illustrate the point that we need not discuss sensational or unusual cases to accomplish our purpose. I give a few brief excerpts here so that the method of studying case histories may be understood.

### Ministering to the Sick — a Case History

The telephone rang one evening when I was about to leave home to conduct a church service. It was Mrs. S., a member of the church.

"Pastor," she said, "J. [her son] is sick. He has been rushed to the hospital. He has appendicitis. We waited too long, and the doctors fear that it has burst and that peritonitis has set in."

"I am very sorry to hear that," I said, "but don't you worry about him. He is in good hands. With God nothing is impossible."

"Can you go and see him?" she asked.

"By all means," I answered. "Of course he will not want to see me now. The doctors will be preparing him for the operation if he is not already in the operating-room. Nor will he want to see me for a while after the operation. I shall see him early in the morning. In the mean time let us pray God to take good care of him and trust God's promises that He will."

"Yes," she said; "that is all we can do."

"And that is enough," I replied.

*Discussion.* — Would you have postponed the church service for a half hour in order to call on a member dangerously ill?

Would you have promised to call on the patient after church, even if you were sure that he would not be conscious?

Is there any value in saying: "He won't want to see me now," rather than "I can't go now"?

---

The following morning I went to see J. The operation had been performed, but J. was on the danger list.

"Good morning, J.," I said; "you are looking very well. How do you feel?"

"Pretty good."

"You should. The worst is over. Just a little quiet rest and patience, and I am sure you will be on your feet again."

There was a brief pause; then I resumed the conversation.

"Why do you think God let this happen to you?"

"I don't know."

"I don't know either," I stated, "but I do know that it is not an accident. He has a purpose in everything that He does. Sometimes He lets these things happen so that we realize how much we depend upon Him. You can't do much to help yourself. God must help you. . . . Will you pray with me for help?"

"Dear heavenly Father, I thank Thee that Thou hast kept me from harm and danger all my life and hast given me health and happiness. Without Thee I can do nothing. On Thee do I wait all the day long. Keep me now, Lord, for Thy mercy's sake. Restore my health. Do not look upon my many sins nor on their account deny my prayer, but for my blessed Savior's sake, in whom Thou lovest me, hear my prayer. Amen."

He thanked me for coming, and I left with the suggestion that he rest in the arms of God.

*Discussion.* — What would you have said when you entered the room?

Would you have apologized for not coming the night before?

Do you have difficulty in getting people to talk when you call on them?

What is the value in having them express themselves?

Do you find that, if you are silent for a few moments, they will speak about themselves?

Is it always necessary to pray when calling on the sick? when making other pastoral calls at the home?

What is the value of *ex-corde* prayer as compared with written prayer?

In this instance would you have referred to the possibility of death and to justification by faith? If so, how?

Would you have "moralized" on the illness during the first call as I did?

Would you have spoken more explicitly of sin as the cause of illness?

Do you always read a portion of Scripture at every call?

---

These excerpts cover one fifth of the case as I have written it. We studied the case in its entirety in conference. I quote only enough to suggest the method.

I believe it would be helpful for other conferences to study case histories, especially for the sake of the younger brethren. Of course, each man has his own style of ministering to the individual, and no one would say exactly what some one else said. That is true of preaching, too. Yet we study homiletics and continue in the ministry to study the sermons of others, though we

would not preach them just that way. Through the study of case histories each man will develop a style all his own. The point is, he will develop. Unless we have reached the stage of perfection in this art, there must be room for improvement.

Surely we cannot be satisfied with walking into the sick-room, saying, "Good morning!" reading a Scripture portion, saying a prayer, and leaving. We ought not call on a prospect for church-membership, invite him to come to church, and let it go at that. We may have done a duty. We may have gotten something off our chests and consciences, but we shall hardly have touched the hearts of the individuals, except in so far as the Word of God always has in itself the power to accomplish the purpose for which it was given. Do we not need to learn the art of weaving a sermonet into the conversation, so that the patient or prospective member will not feel that he has been "preached at"? Must we not learn to pick up cues from the statements of our patients and, with these as a starting-point, lead their minds and hearts into the channels of God's grace and power? Is not this a part of being "apt to teach"?

For those conferences which may want to experiment with the study of case histories let me make a few suggestions.

1. The case should be an actual, not a fictitious one.
2. It should be written up in detail, not in general. A pocket note-book, a few notes after each call, a rewriting in full at the end of the case will serve the purpose. But be truthful; write what you said, not what you think you should have said.
3. It should be written when it occurs, not when the conference assigns it. If a conference is studying case histories, each member will find occasion to write up one case in the course of a year. No more than that are needed. Write your case at your first opportunity, and you will have it ready when the conference needs it.
4. Do not cover only sick-calls. The cases studied in a conference ought to cover the variety of cases as they will occur in the average pastor's experience. Do not pick out sensational cases. Remember that the object is not to justify yourself and to show what a skilful pastor you are, but to provide opportunity for discussion so that all may learn.

In closing, let me say that our discussion of this work suffers somewhat for lack of a good name. There is no accepted English equivalent of the German *Seelsorger*. We might call the ministry to the individual psychotherapy. That is what it is, the cure of the soul. But this term has acquired a connotation of "healing of the mind" and is usually associated with work other than that of

a pastor. Then, too, it sounds somewhat scientific for an humble pastoral visit. I see no good reason, however, why the term could not be introduced among the clergy as the most satisfactory term to cover the subject and gradually be brought to connote what it literally means. If we can speak of homiletics, hermeneutics, and dogmatics, why not psychotherapy? Of course, we would not try to teach our people to refer to their pastor as a psychotherapist, no more than we urge them to call him a homilist or a dogmatician. But considering the valuable and really scientific nature of the pastor's work as a *Seelsorger*, why should we hesitate to call it psychotherapy?

Whatever the term that we adopt, it is my hope that, to the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ, we may all become better servants of His in our ministry to the individual through our study of case histories in psychotherapy.

Wollaston, Mass.

ELMER A. KETTNER

## Outlines on the Wuerttemberg Gospel Selections

### Pentecost

John 14:15-21

We are rejoicing today over the great miracle of Pentecost; and that is as it should be, for the great acts of God in behalf of His Church should fill our hearts with joy and praise, Ps. 106:1, 2. The importance of Pentecost is indicated by the prediction of the event in the Old Testament, especially in Joel 3:1 ff. But just when God would pour out His Spirit among men and what would be the full meaning of it for believers remained for our Savior to reveal to His disciples. And this He does in our text.

#### Our Lord's Comforting Declarations Regarding the Coming and the Work of the Holy Ghost

1. *Jesus promises His disciples another comforter after His departure*
2. *Jesus outlines the work of the Holy Ghost in His disciples*

#### 1

The text is part of Jesus' last utterances. His Passion is about to begin and will terminate with His death. Though He will rise again, He will thereafter not be visible to human sight. Therefore: v. 19a. Hitherto Jesus' presence in the flesh had been a source of consolation to His disciples, e. g., Matt. 14:27. The climax which would take Him from them was rapidly approaching, John 13:21. The "little while," v. 19, had shrunk to a few hours. True,

Jesus had prepared His disciples for the coming events on three different occasions, Matt. 16: 21-28; 17: 22, 23; 20: 17-19, and parallel passages. But the thought of parting with the Master filled the disciples' hearts with sorrow. What would become of them? The outlook was gloomy, as the disciples considered that hereafter they would have to face the world alone. The truth of their characterization Acts 4: 13 weighed heavily upon them.

But our compassionate Lord has words of consolation for them. The key-note of chap. 14-16 is sounded in 14: 1. In v. 15 of our text Jesus first reminds them that they are His true disciples. To "keep Jesus' commandments" means the same as "continue in His Word," His Gospel, John 8: 31. Being His true disciples, they are the object of His particular solicitude. He will not leave them orphans, v. 18. They will not remain unprotected in the world. Jesus promises that He will make intercessions in their behalf with the Father, so that He will give them another comforter after His departure. For "comforter" the Greek has the word "paraclete," literally, an advocate, one called in to aid or support another who is in a difficult position. Hitherto Jesus, the intimate Companion of His disciples, had performed this duty. Now, as He withdraws His visible presence, He promises His disciples the Holy Ghost.

How gloriously did the Savior fulfil His promise. The eloquent description found in Acts 2 of the great events of Pentecost speaks for itself. The Paraclete had come, and all fear of the hostile world had been driven from the disciples' hearts. With a boldness such as they had not known before they proclaimed repentance and salvation in Christ under the guidance and instruction of the Holy Ghost.

But let us note that Jesus promises the Comforter, or Paraclete, not only to the early Christian Church. He is to come "that He may abide with you forever," v. 16. This fact explains the growth of the Christian Church in spite of adverse circumstances and open opposition by the unbelieving world. The coming of the Paraclete and His abiding forever with the Church is a source of consolation for us and reassures us also that out of the present turmoil the Church Militant shall emerge victorious.

But besides dwelling on the coming of the Paraclete, Jesus also outlines the work of the Holy Ghost in the hearts of His disciples.

## 2

The Holy Ghost is "the Spirit of Truth," v. 17. He is this in a double sense. He Himself is Truth. But He is the Spirit of Truth also in so far as He leads into the truth, v. 26; 16: 13. It is His particular function to dwell in the hearts of Christ's disciples, v. 17, and to keep alive in them the knowledge of, and the faith in, the

great spiritual truths of God's Word. It is only natural that this Spirit of Truth cannot be received by the world, v. 17, which Christ characterizes John 8:44. But we know Him. "Every bit of faith, love, obedience, every holy motion, delight in God and His Word, its promises, comfort, etc., is both a mark of the Spirit's presence in us and of our knowledge of who and what He really is."

Another result of the work of the Comforter in the hearts of Christ's disciples is that they see Jesus, v. 19. The Holy Spirit makes them different from the children of this world, who have sight only for material things. The believers have spiritual sight and see their Savior with the eyes of faith. Thus He is ever present with them according to His promise: Matt. 28:20b. In Jesus' company they feel safe and secure on life's journey though there be trials and tribulation.

To the Holy Spirit, Christ's disciples also owe what is stated in v. 20. "At that day" refers to Pentecost. Through the gift of the Spirit they will realize fully what human reason cannot grasp, that Jesus is one with the Father. Therefore He is true God from eternity, and His redemptive work has boundless merit. Furthermore, they will know that they are in Christ, safe in His wounds from the threats of sin and damnation. And, finally, they will also know that Christ is in them, imparting to them His strength and power to bear testimony of Him before the world in life and word.

Let us thank and praise our Lord for the gift of His Holy Spirit and pray that He may ever abide in us with His gracious working.

G. V. SCHICK

### **Pentecost Monday**

**Acts 19:1-7**

Again Christendom has commemorated the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost. Though the miraculous manner and manifestations of that first Pentecostal outpouring are no longer to be expected, and though the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit have ceased, yet the essence of Pentecost continues to the end of days. Now, as then, through appointed means of grace, God's Holy Spirit enlightens, quickens, comforts, Christian hearts and fills them with holy, joyful courage to proclaim the great deeds of salvation. Now, as then, God's Holy Spirit works through the testimony of those who have received Him, for the salvation of souls and the building of the Savior's kingdom.

Certainly the contemplation of all this suggests the pertinent question to all believers: "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since

ye believed?" This question addressed by Paul to the Ephesian disciples might well be addressed to Christians of our day and should, by the grace of God, result in the happy experience of those disciples. To this end let us consider:

**The Resemblance of Many Christians to the Ephesian Disciples**

*1. In their weakness*

*2. In their strengthening*

**1**

A) The Ephesian disciples had been disciples of John the Baptist. Coming to Ephesus recently, they had embraced the Christian faith. They were indeed Christians. However, they were still weak in knowledge. Frankly they answered Paul's question: "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost." Of course, they had heard something and knew something of the Third Person of the Holy Trinity. Their former master, John, had certainly included this in his instruction. They were acquainted also with the Old Testament, which certainly time and again speaks of the Holy Ghost. They had become Christians only through the gracious operation of the Holy Ghost.

They had not heard of the miraculous outpouring of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost. They had not experienced the blessed manifestations of the Spirit of Pentecost. As the apostles before Pentecost, so these disciples were still much in need of enlightenment concerning Christ, concerning the Baptism instituted by Christ, and that it had supplanted the Baptism of John. Cf. Stoeckhardt, *Bibl. Gesch.*, N. T., pp. 386—388. No doubt they lacked clear knowledge of other parts of Christian faith. So they were still without that Pentecostal joyous zeal and courage with which the abundant outpouring of the Spirit had filled other disciples. In short, while disciples, yet much weakness.

B) *Application.* — A striking resemblance indeed to many Christians of our day. (a) In weakness of spiritual knowledge. In an age in which false doctrines run rampant, there is yet so much inability to discriminate, to distinguish, truth from error. So many not well grounded in important doctrines of Holy Writ (election, conversion, etc.). — How many Christians have the knowledge to take a helpful part in doctrinal discussions with friend or foe?

b) Weakness in Christian zeal in the service of Christ and His kingdom. Witness present status of our church-work—mission opportunities unheeded, challenges unanswered, idle candidates, etc.

Surely the question is pertinent "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed," the Spirit of Pentecost with His enlightening, quickening, comforting, sanctifying power? May each and

every one of us in all sincerity put the question to his own heart. And when so we note the resemblance of weakness, may God grant that there arise ever more a resemblance of the Ephesian disciples in their strengthening.

## 2

A) The Ephesian disciples strengthened. (a) Paul instructs them. V. 4 certainly implies and includes an instruction that supplied what those disciples still lacked in knowledge of Christ's person and work, the operation of God's Holy Spirit through Word and Sacrament, etc.

b) V. 5. They were baptized with the Baptism commanded and instituted by Christ.

c) The happy result, v. 6. The happy experience of the disciples on the first day of Pentecost, Acts 2, was now the experience of these Ephesian disciples, with respect to the miraculous and extraordinary gifts and manifestations as well as the abiding ordinary blessings of enlightenment, joy, and zeal.

B) May Christians everywhere ever more resemble these disciples in this experience!

To the end of time God has appointed the means by which the Holy Spirit comes abundantly and dwells in the hearts of Christians, viz., Word and Sacrament. Surely, God has blessed our Church with the purity and abundance of His holy Word. We have our Bibles, beautiful services of worship with proclamations of God's grace, the Sacraments as Christ instituted them. Think of the many agencies available to increase our knowledge, a wealth of Christian literature, educational institutions for young and old (schools, Bible classes, etc.).

Word and Sacrament are vehicles of God's Holy Spirit. As indifference and neglect in the use of these means accounts for the lamentable weakness in Christians today, so diligent, prayerful use of them will surely bring about a greater resemblance to Pentecostal Christians of those early days. Today, through these means, God's Holy Spirit will fill abundantly the hearts of Christians and unfold therein that blessed activity of enlightening, quickening, guiding, etc., which those disciples experienced. And today the Spirit of God will work through the testimony of strengthened Christians as He did of yore, to the glory of our Savior and the extension of His glorious kingdom.

Close with urgent appeal and Hymn 255, sts. 1 and 5.

AUG. F. BERNTHAL

## Trinity Sunday

Matt. 28:18-20

The festival of the Holy Trinity is dedicated to the emphasis and glorification of a great doctrine. This doctrine does not spring from an event in the life of Christ (Christmas, Good Friday, Easter) or in the history of the Church (Pentecost) but is the divine revelation of an eternal truth, which lies beyond the bounds of human experience and can neither be discovered nor analyzed nor comprehended by man — the doctrine of God.

Many would discard all doctrinal preaching. Such preaching, they say, is too theoretical and abstract and not practical enough. They are in error. Every doctrine of the Bible is of practical value. Moreover, there can be no practical Christianity without a doctrinal foundation in Scripture.

So in an eminent degree the doctrine of God. It is basic and indispensable. Every phase of Christian faith, life, work, and hope is anchored in it. Today we restrict ourselves to but one aspect of its practical worth.

### The Scriptural Doctrine of God the Supreme Requirement for Successful Mission-Work

Because of

1. *The purpose of mission-work*
2. *The methods of mission-work*
3. *The difficulties of mission-work*

#### 1

A) What is the purpose of mission work?

1) Not to bring about reforms in the character and conduct of individuals and society nor to build and strengthen the external organization of the congregation or the Church. All this will gradually follow if the purpose of mission-work is achieved, but it dare never be regarded as the purpose itself.

2) But to bring the sinner to God, v. 19: "Make disciples of all nations." Cf. John 17:3; Acts 26:18. (Explain briefly what this implies.)

B) If we would bring the sinner to God, we ourselves must know who the true God is and be able to tell others. It will not suffice to speak of God in vague and general terms, after the manner of pagan philosophers and Modernists; we must proclaim Him as He has revealed Himself in the Scriptures — as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. For this reason the Holy Trinity is stressed in the Great Commission, the Magna Carta of Christian mission-work. (Concise summary of this doctrine, guarding against Unitarianism, on one hand, and tritheism, on the other.)

## 2

Christ charges His Church to "make disciples of all nations." But how? What are the methods to be employed in mission-work?

A) Baptism, v. 19. But not Jewish or pagan baptism, but baptism in the name of the Triune God. The facts that Baptism was to be performed "in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost" and that converts were required to profess faith in the Triune God in their baptismal confession, proves that this doctrine is basic. No one can be a Christian without it. Missionary preaching and persuasion which ignore it are a fraud.

B) Indoctrination, v. 20: "Make disciples," that is, learners. However, all Christian doctrine is rooted in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. 1. The Father: creation plus the Christmas Gospel; 2. the Son: redemption as portrayed in the Good Friday and Easter gospels; 3. the Holy Ghost: sanctification as taught in the Pentecost Gospel. The doctrine of the Holy Trinity is the plan of salvation in a nutshell. Hence the fundamental creed of Christendom, the Apostles' Creed, is an expansion of it. 2 Cor. 13:14. Faith grows and deepens with the understanding and appreciation of this doctrine. Much of the uncertainty and foggiess of modern preaching and Christianity is the result of its neglect.

C) Training, v. 20: "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Also the Christian way of life has its origin in the Holy Trinity. 1. The Father: this very name reveals what our relation to God is to be and in what spirit we should strive to keep His commandments (Luther's explanation of "Our Father who art in heaven" and of the Commandments — "We should fear and love God that. . ."); 2. the Son: our great Teacher with supreme and universal authority, v. 18; Mark 9:7, the divine pattern after which we should fashion our lives, 1 Pet. 2:21, the source of our sanctification, 1 Cor. 1:30; John 15:5; Phil. 4:12, 13; 3. the Holy Ghost: without Him all Christian training and all efforts at Christian living must prove futile, Rom. 8:14; Gal. 5:16; 1 Thess. 5:23.

Accordingly, even the methods we apply in our mission-work are determined by the doctrine of the Holy Trinity.

## 3

A) Our mission-work is beset with great difficulties and many apparently insuperable obstacles. Some are the result of the spiritual attitude of those to whom we bring the Gospel; others of external conditions. (Examples.)

B) Thank God, these difficulties are conquerable in the light of the Holy Trinity. 1. We have a heavenly Father of supreme

authority and power, with whom nothing is impossible and before whose omnipotence even the gates of hell must crumble. 2. We have a Savior to whom the Father has given all this authority and power and who is with us in our work, v. 20b; Matt. 18:20. Hence, we are never alone. 3. In the Holy Ghost we have a Comforter, a Helper, whom Christ has placed at our side, John 14:16, and who has the power of molding the hearts of men and breaking down their resistance to the truth, Zech. 4:6; Luke 24:29; John 15:26; Heb. 2:4. With such aid we need not despair in the face of perplexing missionary problems and apparent reverses.

*Conclusion.* — This, then, is the practical value of the doctrine of God for our missionary endeavors. (Brief recapitulation following line of direction in theme.) May we immerse ourselves in this glorious truth and employ it conscientiously in all our work.

E. J. FRIEDRICH

### First Sunday after Trinity

Mark 4:26-32

In this text Jesus tells us how things are in the kingdom of God. To understand the text, we must first know what He meant by the expression "kingdom of God." He did not mean something earthly that you can see, Luke 17:20; He meant something inside the heart, Luke 17:21; He meant our faith, our religion, and everything connected with it—the Church, the preaching of the Gospel, and heaven. So we may learn something of very great significance from this text:

#### What Jesus Teaches about Religion

1. *There is sowing of seed*
2. *There is life and growth*
3. *There is fruit and harvest*

#### 1

The kingdom of God is like a man sowing seed. Seed is being sown on the grain-fields of the world. You may watch the sower on one field, and you may think that this is being done in the next field, in the next county, in the next State, over all the nation, over all the world. It is a stupendous activity. — In religion the seed of God's Word is sown far and wide, over all the world. Jesus commanded this, Matt. 28:19. Through the medium of pulpit, school, Sunday-school, books, periodicals, radio, and in other ways the seed of the Word is sown. That must be done in the kingdom of God. — Seed is sown on all kinds of soil — fertile, barren, rocky, weedy ground, on level fields and sloping hillsides. — The seed of God's Word must be sown where rich harvest may be expected and where

results are meager, in organized congregations and in foreign mission-fields. — Something will grow on the fields without sowing seed, but it will be weeds. Only where grain is sown, will there be a crop of value. Something grows in human hearts without God's Word, but it is error, hypocrisy, wickedness, Matt. 15:19. Only when God's Word is sown, is there truth, sincerity, piety. Only where the Gospel of Christ is preached, can there be saving faith and a good life.

## 2

In the kingdom of God there is life and growth.

A wonderful thing is going on under the soil in a grain-field. You may see nothing but the bare soil. But beneath that soil there is stupendous activity; the seed is germinating; soon a slender shoot of green will appear; and after a while the field will be covered with plants, alive and growing. You may look at the same field a few months later on a quiet day. There will be many thousands of plants, but they will appear as if they were standing still. But each plant is growing and developing every minute of the day. The whole field is the scene of teeming life and tremendous growth, though hidden from our eyes. — So in religion there is life and growth. The seed is powerful and produces life, Is. 55:9-11; Rom. 10:17. Where God's Word is preached, there faith and Christian conduct is engendered. Sometimes this life-giving activity of the seed of God's Word is hindered and halted (parable of the Sower), but this is not the fault of the seed. And where the Word is preached, there is constant growth, in knowledge, in faith, in Christian life, Phil. 1:3-11. Often such life and growth in religion are not noticed. We think the Church is at a standstill. We worry about the future of religion, of the Church. Religion sometimes seems dead. But the life and growth are there, hidden from our eyes. Parents and pastors worry about a youth or maiden whose religion appears to be dead. Perhaps there is still something there, and it will show life in due time.

## 3

In the kingdom of God there is fruit and harvest. On the fields the stems produce grain. And when the valuable grain is ripe, it is harvested and brought to the granaries. — So it is also in religion. Christians become fruitful in good works; faith produces piety, Jas. 1:27; 2:17. And when the Christian has been long enough in the world, he is taken away to heaven by the Lord of the harvest, Rev. 14:13.

FREDERICK NIEDNER

## Second Sunday after Trinity

Luke 15:11-32

If by some calamity we were to lose the whole Bible and could save only one chapter, very likely we would choose Luke 15, the chapter from which our text is taken. Three parables: the Lost Sheep, the Lost Coin, the Prodigal Son — all treating the story of God's love to poor sinners. Among these three jewels one gleams the brightest: the parable of the Prodigal Son.

### The Parable of the Prodigal Son

Let us consider:

1. *Sin in its depths*
2. *Love at its height*
3. *Self-righteousness at its worst*

#### 1

The younger son came from a good home. But sin enters everywhere. The son who had once been the father's pride and joy now becomes the slave of sin. "Father, give me" — he is disrespectful, unfeeling, saying in effect that his father is living too long for him. "Not many days after" — he is impatient to plunge into the new freedom. "Gathered all together" — greed and selfishness control him. "Into a far country" — he will have no more restraining influences. "Wasted his substance" — a spendthrift who knows only how to indulge his baser passions. "Riotous living" (original about this: a hopeless case) — the life of one whom no relief agency can put back on his feet. "Joined himself" (original as much as glued himself to a citizen) — he was one of those characters whose impudence is unbearable. "Husks" — how sin can reduce one's standard of living! "Feed the swine" — sin can bring a man down to the lowest company. No wonder the father said: He was "dead."

All this is typical of what sin can do and does: it hardens men, lures them to a false freedom, makes them impatient of any restraint that decent people may seek to exercise, makes them selfish and unfeeling, and does not stop until it has plunged them into destruction and perdition.

This son is one who had been in the "father's house." This part of the parable therefore applies particularly also to people who once sat in church pews, were confirmed at altars, read their Bible, but became secure, believed they could afford to toy with sin and learned by bitter experience that sin is a hard master.

Let us ask ourselves whether we have already yielded to this sin. Have we left the Father's house into which we had been

placed by faith in Christ? Have we thought that we must flee the restraints of a loving Father in heaven? Then let us penitently confess: "Father, I have sinned."

## 2

The loving father. This father could not forget his son; he longed for his return. "When he was yet a great way off, his father saw him"—love still looks for the wayward sinner. "He had compassion"—love wins out over justice. "Ran"—age does not restrain this father. "Fell on his neck and kissed him"—love does not stop at tattered clothes, disheveled appearance, and a disgraceful past. The father refuses to consider that the son be anything but a son in the future. "Bring forth the best robe . . . on his feet"—the promised sonship is to be made outwardly evident to all. "Bring hither the fatted calf . . . be merry"—such joy over the son's return must be shared.

All this is a picture of God's love to the penitent sinner. The parable fairly glitters with detail to show this love, more than a dozen items embellishing the parable just for this purpose.

This is a word of God to every penitent sinner. Your sins may be many; they may disgrace you before God and men; they may be of the vilest kind; yet there is no sin so great, no condition so wretched, but the love of God in Christ is ready to say: "My son." Ps. 86:5; Eph. 4:32.

## 3

We might think that the parable should have ended before the third character, the brother, enters the picture. But he is needed that by contrast the love of God may appear all the more impressive and that all self-righteousness be shunned.

The elder son is a typical self-righteous man. "He was angry"—he would have been more satisfied if that lost brother had never been heard of again. "Would not go in"—an ugly attitude expressed in moping action. "These many years do I serve thee"—self-righteousness likes to say: Look what I did! "Neither transgressed I at any time thy commandment"—what a high opinion a self-righteous man finally has of himself! "Thou never gavest me a kid"—he feels that God does not give him a fair deal. "Thy son"—will not call him "brother." "Devoured thy living with harlots"—self-righteousness always finds and mentions the *worst* offenses of a brother. "Hast killed for *him* the fatted calf"—self-righteousness always sees God's favor given to the wrong man.

This brother is a warning against self-righteousness, also that often found among church-members. Satan also tempts church-members to forget that they are saved alone by grace, leads them to believe it is their being better than others which assures them of

God's favor. The self-righteous man rejects the righteousness of his Savior and trusts in himself. Rom. 10:3.

May God ever be our Refuge and Strength that, trusting in His unfathomable love to sinners, we may finally hear His gracious words "This My son was dead and is alive again; he was lost and is found."

H. O. A. KEINATH

### Third Sunday after Trinity

Matt. 15:1-14

As Luther pointed out more than four hundred years ago, one of the greatest dangers that confronts a congregation or a church-body is that of externalization. This warning has again and again been corroborated during the past four centuries, in various parts of Christendom. External features, at first introduced or re-introduced for the purpose of embellishment, become ends in themselves instead of being employed as means only. Rules and regulations made in the interest of a better administration of church affairs soon are emphasized more strongly than the purity of Biblical doctrine. Under such circumstances the worship of a congregation, and even of an entire church-body, may soon degenerate into a mere outward form, hiding an empty and hypocritical attitude. Hence the need of the Lord's admonition and instruction just at the present time.

#### The Lord's Distinction between False and True Worship

1. *He shows the shallowness and the insufficiency of a mere outward worship*
2. *He indicates the character of true worship*

#### 1

a) False worship is characterized by an insistence upon outward forms and rites: insistence upon the washing of hands; placing the outward rite of a gift ostensibly consecrated to God above the actual commandments of God; upholding of traditions which had no basis in the Word of God, as essential or necessary parts of worship. See vv. 2, 5, 6.

b) False worship is characterized by a mere outward performance of prayer as a rite. See vv. 7, 8. Commandments of men, v. 9.

c) False worship often results in the blind leading the blind; men who themselves are no longer sure of the divine truth presume to be teachers of others. See v. 14.

Indications of a similar externalization in our days, in insistence upon forms and vestments and particular observances, should prove a warning to us!

## 2

Over against all such externalism the Lord places the character of a true worship, that which is well-pleasing to Him.

a) It is a worship of the heart, v. 8 b; one which grows from an acceptance of the truth by faith and an emotional reaction in keeping with the true nature of faith. Cp. Gal. 5:6 b; John 13:17.

b) It manifests itself in keeping the commandments of God with a pure heart, for no tradition and regulation of men may weaken or destroy the Word. See vv. 3, 4. Not the choice of foods or the abstaining from certain foods by the commandment of men is a test of true religion, but guarding the mouth against sinful words. V. 11.

c) It avoids the leadership of blind leaders, who lead others astray by their insistence upon the commandments of men. See vv. 13, 14.

The one great need of the Church in these days is the hearing of the Word of God, the constant study of the Holy Scriptures, and the keeping of this truth in confession and in life. Being justified through faith, daily growing in the knowledge of God's Word, we shall bear abundant fruit in true sanctification.

P. E. KRETZMANN



---

**Theological Observer — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches**


---

**Summer-School at River Forest.**—Dean W. O. Kraeft submits this information to the readers of our journal:

"1. In the summer-school, Concordia Teachers' College, River Forest, offers courses leading to the bachelor's degree in elementary education.

"2. The courses offered during the summer at River Forest are, to a great extent, duplicates of the curriculum offered in the training of teachers during the school-year.

"3. The summer-school offers courses for lady teachers, which will prepare them more definitely for teaching in Lutheran parish-schools.

"4. Choirmasters and organists will find courses enabling them to take the leadership in beautifying the services by way of music.

"5. St. Louis Seminary again offers courses in theology to pastors.

"6. Some courses of the new Concordia Sunday-school Teachers' Training Series are also offered to Sunday-school teachers who were not able to get these in their home congregation." A.

**"Within the Framework of Lutheranism."**—That is the caption of an article in the *Lutheran Herald*, Feb. 25, by J. Reini, which takes exception to the views expressed in the article "Trends within Our Church," published in *Lutheraneren*, Oct. 12, 1938. The author of "Trends," "a well-known pastor of our Church" "had observed many trends in our Church: high-church and low-church; pietism and antipietism; some against unionism, others not; some against lodges, others not; some especially advocating pure doctrine, others especially a holy life. Some members of our Church feel rather grieved because of them. But the author of 'Trends' takes a different view; he is rather in favor of them; they are for him a sign of spiritual life. His advice is: 'Allow every one to believe, talk, and work according to his own view, provided that it is within the frame of the Word of God and our Confessions. Do not judge others who may favor opposite views.' . . . He declares that a Church either entirely without any or with only one trend is both dead and orthodoxistic: 'Only a dead and orthodoxistic Church can be built and kept without trends.' . . ."

"This review of the Lutheran churches, however, cannot be finished without inquiring as to the standing of the Missouri Synod. We might wonder whether the author of 'Trends' really by his description of the dead and orthodoxistic Church could have in mind the Missouri Synod. That Church has now for nearly one hundred years been noted for its God-fearing zeal for pure doctrine and Christian living. For many years it has also enjoyed unparalleled blessing in being free from annoying trends and discords. And we certainly would have to apologize most humbly if we ever thought any one familiar with the history and work of the Missouri Synod could characterize her as 'orthodoxistic' and 'dead.'"

The important part of the *Herald* article is this: "But the author's advice to give room for different trends and views is not in harmony

with the Word of God. Of the Church founded on the day of Pentecost by the apostles we read that they were all of one accord, 'of one heart and of one soul,' Acts 4:32. . . . If the rule, adopted by both our church organs, that all the various spiritual trends remain strictly within the framework of Lutheranism always and everywhere could be observed, no doubt many offenses would be avoided; but there is no leader of any party that will admit that his erroneous ideas are not in accord with the Word of God, and it appears to us that even the author of 'Trends' does not follow his own regulation. He reproves not only what is blameful but also finds fault with orthodox teaching. He touches lightly tendencies to unionism and the 'sin of lodgery,' as if such trends perhaps could be compatible with our Confessions, and does not find it needful to give earnest warnings against them. We may meet 'Lutherans' who accept the Bible as the Word of God but deny the saying of the apostle that 'all Scripture is given by inspiration of God,' 2 Tim. 3:16. And there are even members of our congregations that are unwilling to see that the religion of the lodges is repugnant and hostile to Christianity and to take note of the fact that the big United Lutheran Church, even among its clergy, has numbers of its leading men who not only take part in the religious services of the lodges but who also are active members of such organizations. . . . When we recall that even the apostolic churches were admonished to 'walk circumspectly' and to be on guard against 'diverse and strange doctrines,' can we then say that such warnings are not needed or timely at present? . . ." E.

**The Kingdom of God.**— Under this heading the *Journal of Theology* of the American Lutheran Conference (February, 1941) publishes a timely article, directed against the Ritschlian view that the kingdom of God represents a "social order or economic or political concept," which is being reemphasized today by E. Stanley Jones (*Christ or Communism*), who "outlines a social system or form of government on the basis of Christ's text at Nazareth [Luke 4:18, 19?]" and calls that the kingdom of God." The writer (Rev. Mikkel Lono) arrives at the following final conclusions: "The kingdom of God is not a social order but the will of God operating in the hearts of those who believe. Its blessings are apart from circumstances of life, the rich [as such?] having no advantage but rather the contrary; yet the kingdom influences powerfully all of life. The kingdom of God is the only effective force for social betterment operating in the world. The Gospel of personal salvation is the most effective means of promoting general welfare. Because of ignorance and the blindness caused by sin, even sincere Christians need encouragement and admonition in letting their light so shine that men may see their good works. The preaching of social justice and other ideals of the social gospel has a definite place in the Christian message, but this not the 'Gospel of the Kingdom.'"

We are glad that this important truth again receives emphasis, especially in a periodical like the *Journal*, which is not confined to a single synod, but reaches many and diverse theological groups. Just now when Dr. E. Stanley Jones, under the auspices of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, is again preaching the "new social order of Christianity" as the realization of the kingdom of God, Lutherans

ought to be united in the testimony that the social gospel is not the "Gospel of the Kingdom." When the writer declares that the "preaching of social justice and other ideals of the social gospel has a definite place in the Christian message," this applies, of course, to the inculcation of Christian sanctification, and that *intra ecclesiam*, for the Church is not the State's moral police agent enforcing in *regno mundi* social justice and other ideals. As Luther correctly says, the Church rules only by the Word which it proclaims, and this within its proper spiritual sphere. This fact the writer himself suggests in his article.

In his article, however, there is a lack of clarity with regard to the expression "the kingdom of God," and this is disturbing to the reader. He defines the kingdom of God as the "will of God operating in the hearts of those who believe." Properly understood, this description is correct. In Schirlitz's *Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament* the kingdom of God is described, in its Messianic sense, "als das, in dem Gottes Wille gilt." More comprehensive and adequate perhaps is the definition of the kingdom of God as "the rule of Christ in the hearts of believers." God's kingdom must be limited in this way, in order that its *spiritual nature* may be stressed in contradistinction to the divine *regnum potentiae*, in which God rules by His sovereign will, or Law. If, in an absolute sense, the kingdom of God is simply called the *Kingdom*, this is done because it is the *preeminent* kingdom, the kingdom κατ' ἐξοχὴν, all earthly kingdoms being merely temporal and temporary, existing only within God's kingdom and serving His kingdom. It is called the "kingdom of God" because it has God for its author and goal. It is called the "kingdom of heaven" because it is substantially heavenly and spiritual. It is called the "kingdom of Christ" because our blessed Savior is the Lord and Mediator of this kingdom. All these assertions can be supported by clear Scripture-passages.

There is in the article also a lack of clarity with regard to the question whether the terms "kingdom of God" and "Church" are synonymous. The writer says: "At first thought it would seem that the kingdom and the Church are almost synonymous." Then, after having pointed out that the word "Church" is used in the New Testament with various meanings, causing theologians to distinguish between the visible and the invisible Church, he writes: "In the minds of these theologians the invisible Church and the kingdom of God are the same." However, he objects that "in all but a few passages the terms 'Church' and 'kingdom' are evidently not interchangeable." "Yet," he concludes, "they are related. I have merely indicated their distinction." We admit this distinction, for while the expressions "kingdom of God" or "kingdom of Christ" or "kingdom of heaven" essentially describe God's [Christ's] spiritual rule in the hearts of believers, the term "Church" refers to the *communio*, or *congregatio sanctorum*, in which the Lord has established His rule, properly speaking, the *ecclesia invisibilis*, in a wider sense the *ecclesia visibilis*, either in one place or in the entire world. But this does not mean that the two are fundamentally distinct, so that the kingdom of Christ exists in a different place than where the Church is, and vice versa. As Dr. F. Pieper rightly puts it, the two actually coincide, so that wherever the kingdom of Christ (of God, of

heaven) is, there also is the Church, and *vice versa*. More definitely, Dr. Pieper writes: "The Kingdom of Grace and the Church of God upon earth (*ecclesia militans*) are synonymous." (Cf. *Christliche Dogmatik*, II: 461 ff.; III: 458 ff.) It is only when we speak in this way that we can clearly understand the Scripture references to the kingdom of God and the Church. So also Luther and our Lutheran dogmaticians have expressed themselves, and both their *modus concipiendi* and their *modus loquendi* are clear and Scriptural, so that we cannot improve on them. Luther writes: "The kingdom of God is the Church of Christ, which is ruled by the Word of God." (St. L., XXI a: 452.) That Luther regarded the terms "kingdom of Christ" and "Church" as practically synonymous, is clear also from such expressions as these: "Wherever the Gospel is preached in its truth and purity, there is Christ's kingdom; and this mark of the Church or the Kingdom of Christ, cannot deceive you." (St. L., VI: 30.) J. T. M.

**A U. L. C. A. Writer on Predestination.** — Writing in the *Lutheran* of February 12, Dr. J. Wm. McCauley of Salem, Va., has this to say on Predestination:

"If it is 'the will of God that none should perish but that all should be saved' (1 Tim. 2:4), why need we worry about it? An 'Ironside' Baptist preacher said to me in positive terms: 'I am predestined to be either saved or lost. God knows best and will do what is right.' And he added: 'Even if I am predestined for hell rather than for heaven, God's will be done.' That is the rankest sort of predestination, with free will of man ruled out. Many Presbyterians have given up the old absolute predestination for a limited kind, including a measure of free will. It is claimed that Martin Luther once believed in predestination, or foreordination, but later substituted foreknowledge, that is, God foreknows but does not foreordain. Man has the free will to reject salvation but not to secure it, for salvation is of God only. 'By grace have ye been saved, through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God' (Eph. 2:8).

"The other day a young person asked me, as have many others not acquainted with theological terms, if I believed in 'predestination.' That word seems to be in general use and popularly understood. Be that as it may, everybody knows what 'a worm' is and what is 'a man.' When some one was referred to as being 'a jellyfish and not a man,' the audience understood and laughed. 'A worm' is what David called himself when he said, 'I am a worm and no man' (Ps. 22:6). Poe wrote a gruesome poem on how man will be vanquished at death by 'the conqueror Worm.' The psalmist asked, 'What is man that Thou art mindful of him, and the Son of Man, that Thou visitest him?' But he gave the triumphant answer, 'Thou hast made him but little lower than God [R. V.] and crownedst him with glory and honor. Thou makest him to have dominion over the works of Thy hands. Thou hast put all things under his feet' (Ps. 8:4-6). In the seeming contradiction of his groveling, crawling, helpless, earthly life in the flesh and His soaring, triumphant life of the spirit in the image of God is the problem and the answer. In His free will, the power to choose the better way, to mount on the wings of language and faith and spiritual communion into the

eternal and holy, is the key to the solution of the age-old problem. Yes, the worm will have wings and fly!"

This is confusing language. Note the fog in which the figure of Luther is left and abandoned. When the writer says, "Man has the free will to reject salvation — but not to secure it, for salvation is of God only," he correctly expresses a great Scripture truth. But what does he mean when in conclusion he says, "In His free will, the power to choose the better way, to mount on the wings of language and faith and spiritual communion into the eternal and holy, is the key to the solution of the age-old problem"? Is the writer speaking of Christ? His use of a capital initial in writing the pronoun "His" would seem to justify such an assumption. But how strange is the language if a reference to the Savior is intended! And if merely man is spoken of the espousal of synergism is unblushingly direct and manifest. A.

**Concordia and Culture.** — That is the heading the *Christian Century* of March 5 gives the following communication:

"EDITOR, 'THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY':

"Sir: I note that in a recent issue of your paper some brickbats are tossed at the Missouri Synod of the Lutheran Church. I am not a member of this religious group, but, being a historian, I feel that I should correct these erroneous statements. You say that the Missouri Synod Lutherans are descended from peasants. As a matter of fact, the forebears of the Missouri Synod Lutherans were far removed from 'peasants.' Among them were skilled artisans, writers, lawyers, teachers, physicians, and theologians. Indeed, it is hard to find any pioneer group that had as high an intellectual average as these German pioneers who laid the foundations of the Missouri Synod.

"Furthermore, you further malign these pioneers as 'misunderstanding everything which does not fit into their rigid pattern.' Well, are you not tarred by the same stick? You have certainly misunderstood their history, and very sadly at that. In fact, you know little about it.

"You further say that these pioneers were 'suspicious of culture itself.' Here I have to smile out loud, inasmuch as the scholars and theologians in this group early established Concordia Seminary, which has grown to be the largest Protestant theological seminary in the world.

"Pennsylvania State Senate

C. HALE SIPE"

While we do not attach great importance to this matter, the item certainly has historical value. Besides, it evidences the good will of Senator Sipe. E.

**Subscription to the Lutheran Confessions. . . . The Restoration of the Confessional.** — A word of praise is due, we believe, to the *Journal of Theology of the American Lutheran Conference* (March, 1941) on its fine selections of articles, three of which concern themselves directly with questions of theology, making the issue very readable and attractive. The five articles are: "What does Subscription to the Lutheran Confessions Imply?" "The Minister and Mental Hygiene"; "The Mode of Baptism"; "The Restoration of the Confessional"; "Practical Teacher-

training Courses." Besides these articles there are, of course, "theological-observer" items and book reviews; but our interest just now is in the articles. Articles 3 and 5 are both helpful and interesting and supply fine variation by transferring the reader to the practical department, on which the minister, too, must be informed. But we were especially pleased with the editorial staff's selection of theological articles, since this manifests a new appreciation of doctrinal essentials. After all, theology is the life-blood of a Church, without which it is bound to die of spiritual pernicious anemia. We are sure that, if the *Journal* will continue this editorial policy, it will not only increase its reading circle but also largely assist in bringing about that inward unity which is so absolutely necessary to true church union.

Much in the articles bears quoting, as it represents a reemphasis on truths always held sacred by confessing Lutherans. Writes Rev. A. G. Wacke (Hamler, O.) in his article on "Subscription to the Lutheran Confessions": "The Church is altogether in the right when it requires that its servants faithfully adjust their teachings to the symbols not *quatenus* but *quia*. Naturally, only he can do this who is inwardly convinced that the churchly symbols are the adequate expression of the doctrine of Scripture that sprang up from the soil of the divine Word and agree with the same." That is very fine and gives us a solid basis for church union. If all Lutherans could agree on the meaning of subscription to the Lutheran Confessions, then, we believe, the divisions now existing in the Lutheran circles in the United States would soon disappear. Or again: "We confess the symbols not because they were composed by our theologians, but because they have been taken from the Word of God and are founded firmly and well therein, after the custom of the early Church, whereby succeeding councils, Christian bishops and teachers appealed to the Nicene Creed and confessed it that condemned errors might not steal into the Church of God. Here we not only repeat our doctrine but also the cause and ground why we have abandoned errors and idolatries and know, and can think, of no way for coming to any agreement with those who champion such errors and idolatries." Dogmatically expressed, this means that we need not only the *norma decisionis* of Scripture but also the *norma discretionis* of our Confessions, which *discernit orthodoxos ab heterodoxis*. Emphasis on this point is very, very necessary. Next to the study of Scripture that of our Confessions ought to come in our scholastic pursuits. We only deceive ourselves if we study merely the peripheral concomitants of our ministry and avoid the "weightier things of the Law."

In his article on "The Mode of Baptism" Rev. E. F. Janssen (Denver, Colo.) reaches the conclusion that, since "the efficacy of baptism lies not in the amount of water used but rather in the Word of God, it does indeed seem foolish to argue back and forth about the mode of baptism. Christ has not commanded the one or the other mode with express words. Had He wished us to use a certain mode, He would have told us that in plain language. We can therefore not agree with those who say that this or that must be the mode of baptism. Any mode of baptism is permissible." This may seem elementary to some, but is it not true that throughout our earthly life we do not get beyond elementary

dogmatics? Did not even the apostles state and restate elementary teachings throughout their epistles? It is, after all, the elementary dogmatics that is so very hard to get straight.

In his article on "The Restoration of the Confessional" Rev. R. I. Knudson (Kintyre, N. Dak.) reemphasizes the great need in the Lutheran Church of private confession. It should, of course, be evangelical, not legalistic: "The confessional exists for the sake of the absolution. . . . The confessional is Gospel-orientated ('The ministry of absolution is favor, or grace'), while Romanist theology and practice emphasize the confessional as an exploration of the conscience, the absolution being conditioned both by priestly intention and the enumeration of all remembered mortal sins." In the article there is at least a trace of a legalistic note; for the writer says: "Every communicant member should know that he is expected at the sacristy at the least once a year. If all are expected to commune at least once a year, then no one feels embarrassed in going for registration, and tongues are given no occasion to wag." Such "expectation of at least once a year" might become very dangerous, promoting an externalism at this point that would be fatal. No, let the private confession be conducted in so evangelical and winning a way that the communicants come to the confessional and the Holy Supper cheerfully and gladly just because of the grace and favor which is offered them in the pastor's absolution. Those who despise the Word and the Sacrament must be dealt with according to Matt. 18. And that can still be accomplished.

The writer once more wishes to express his joy at the rich theological content of the March issue of the *Journal*. If even Reinhold Niebuhr (cf. *Time*, March 24, 1941) is swinging back to a more positive theology (cf. *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, Vol. I: "The idea that man is sinful at the very center of his personality . . . is universally rejected. It is this rejection which has seemed to make the Christian Gospel simply irrelevant to modern man"), how much more should we Lutherans foster the "queen of studies"—doctrinal theology! J. T. M.

**Church Census Figures Are Not Reassuring.**—The figures of the 1936 religious census, which have been recently released by the Federal Census Bureau, are not altogether reassuring to the Christian churches of America. Indeed, they are somewhat disturbing. The most discouraging thing about them is the fact that they reveal a growth in population ten times more rapid than the increase in church-membership. In other words, while the country's population from 1926 to 1936 was increasing about 13,000,000, the number of souls added to the church rolls totaled only 1,331,020. In other decades the growth of the Church has been more rapid than the increase in population.

Seven of the more important denominations, according to census figures, suffered actual loss during the period from 1926 to 1936. These include the Baptists, Presbyterians, Methodists, Episcopalians, Disciples of Christ, Congregationalists and Christians, and Quakers. [NOTE.—The figures, so we are assured by the denominational journals, do not necessarily represent actual losses, but are in some instances due to failure to participate in the census.—Ed., C. T. M.]

Body	1936	1926	Decrease
Baptists .....	8,262,287	8,441,030	178,743
Methodists .....	7,001,637	8,070,619	1,068,982
Presbyterians .....	2,513,653	2,625,284	111,631
Episcopalians .....	1,735,335	1,859,086	123,751
Disciples of Christ .....	1,196,315	1,377,595	181,280
Congregationalists and Christians	976,388	994,491	18,103
Quakers .....	93,697	110,422	16,725

The church-bodies showing gains in the 1936 census are the following:

Body	1936	1926	Increase
Roman Catholics .....	19,914,937	18,605,003	1,309,934
Jewish bodies .....	4,641,184	4,081,242	559,942
Lutherans .....	4,245,160	3,965,152	208,008
Mormons .....	774,169	606,561	168,608
Evangelicals and Reformed .....	523,877	675,804	48,073
Christian Scientists .....	268,915	202,098	66,817
Seventh-Day Adventists .....	133,254	110,998	22,256
Salvation Army .....	103,938	74,768	28,270

As we view the above figures, we find consolation in only one fact, namely, the apparent discrepancy between the Government census figures and the official figures of our own Lutheran church-bodies. Instead of 4,245,160 the official Lutheran figures for 1936 were 4,624,134. This would mean that the Lutheran Church gained 586,982 during the decade instead of 208,008, which is a considerable difference! If the other church-bodies suffered in a like manner at the hands of the Federal census, the actual religious picture of America is not nearly as gloomy as the above tables would indicate. However, this is a matter into which church statisticians ought to delve very energetically as well as conscientiously, for it is of the utmost importance that the churches should know the truth.

In any event, it is quite apparent that there is much work to be done if America is to be won for Christ. The paganizing influences at work in this country today are legion, and the Church needs to be keenly alive to the tremendous odds it faces. These are trying days for the Church throughout the world. Let it labor and pray without ceasing that it may not fail in the great task it has received from its Lord.

*The Lutheran Companion*, March 20, 1941

**A Discussion of Unionism.** — In the *Lutheran Standard* for April 19 we find two articles and an editorial dealing with the subject of unionism. We here reprint in part, with a few comments, the article written by Dr. Albert A. Jagnow of Dubuque, Iowa:

"Our difficulty in this matter of fellowship arises from a conflict of duties. On the one hand, we are members of the one holy Christian Church, the body of Christ on earth, and it is perfectly clear from the New Testament that membership in the Church ideally involves earthly fellowship also. On the other hand, we are members of a particular denomination which has its peculiar contributions to make in the interpretation of the Gospel, and as Lutherans we must witness the truth we know (the primacy of faith, the reality of the Presence in Communion, the freedom of the life of faith, etc.). From this it follows that

"1. We must acknowledge our fellow-Christians and cooperate with them in common Christian enterprises in which the Church speaks as with one voice against the world.

"2. In such cooperation we must never compromise the full truth of the Gospel as we have found it in Scripture. Sometimes we do not know whether we should follow the greater loyalty or the lesser, the Church Universal or our denomination.

"Some specific instances may help to make this clear. Since the Church is one, we can pray with all who acknowledge Jesus Christ as Lord, whether our prayer be private or public. We can sing the songs of all Christian writers. Since our nation is a Christian land, we can help direct its aspirations aright as we celebrate its great holidays with proper services. Again, we may well display the flag in church, together with the Christian flag, as symbol of our allegiance to God and to our land. Again, it would be quite all right to invite patriotic groups (American Legion, D.A.R., etc.) or social-service groups (Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Girl Reserve, etc.) to attend some of our services in a body. The Church is commissioned to preach the Gospel to all people, and sometimes she can, through an organization, reach those who else would not hear.

"Again, in periods of national emergency or of local social or industrial strife it may be necessary for your congregation and pastor to cooperate with other Christian churches in helping the Church to speak with one voice as the conscience of the world. In works of charity and love, especially in times of great need, such cooperation is also indicated. Worship is not confined to one department of life nor to one day in the week. It ought to hallow the whole of life. Our Lutheran Church has not always done its duty toward the society in which it lives. Let it bear witness wherever opportunity offers. The Church dare not separate herself from the world though she is not of the world.

"In such matters as joint baccalaureate or joint patriotic services the individual case will have to be decided on its own merits. As long as the Gospel will be obscured by the proceedings, we had best be absent.

Can a member of another Christian Church receive Communion in the Lutheran Church? Here opinion is divided. Some say that according to the Galesburg Rule this is out of the question. Others point out that every rule has exceptions and that it is *the Lord's Table*, not ours!

"We need to remember two things. 1. We belong to the one holy Christian Church on earth and therefore are in duty bound to cooperate with other Christians in large issues, so that the Church may speak with one voice as the conscience of the world and may act together as its Good Samaritan. 2. We are members of the Lutheran Church, a denomination which must witness to its specific insight into the Gospel. We must therefore act not only as Lutherans, clearly testifying to the truth given us; but we must also act as Christians, fellow-members with all other Christians in the body of Christ on earth.

"This whole question of 'unionism' is not a simple one and needs to be carefully thought through again and again in the light of Scriptural principles, not merely in the light of churchly expediency and sectional traditionalism."

What shall we say? It is very true that membership in the Church is by no means limited to one denomination. We of the Missouri Synod cheerfully and gratefully acknowledge that there are Christians in non-Lutheran church-bodies. It is one of the great principles which our Synod has always stood for. The trouble is that through the membership of believers in heterodox churches, in which precious truths of the Gospel are spurned, they make it impossible for us to recognize them and to associate with them as our Christian brethren. By their membership they assist in carrying on a war against what is divine revelation. As everybody knows, no one of us has the ability to read human hearts. All that we can be guided by is the profession of the mouth which people make and the flag under which they have placed themselves. If that flag announces rejection of what the apostles and prophets have taught, we cannot call those that march under it brethren in the faith.

Is the sentence of Dr. Jagnow acceptable "We must acknowledge our fellow-Christians and cooperate with them in common Christian enterprises in which the Church speaks as with one voice against the world"? The sentence as we understand it means that we must be willing to join with other denominations in religious enterprises concerning which all are agreed. Dr. Jagnow overlooks the divisive character of false teachings. "If ye continue in My Word, then are ye My disciples indeed," says the Savior. How can we strike up a religious alliance with people that are not continuing in the Word of the Savior? That here and there their objectives are the same as ours does not remove their opposition to divine truth in other points.

Is it right to hold that, "since the Church is one, we can pray with all who acknowledge Jesus Christ as Lord, whether our prayer be private or public"? That is one of the most sweeping sentences on prayer-fellowship which we have seen. If his brethren in the American Lutheran Church tried to practice what is here laid down, Dr. Jagnow himself, we imagine, would stand aghast. Let him visualize one of his associates appearing in a Congregationalist church some Sunday morning and there speaking the chief prayer! His principle as enunciated above would permit such a course. Or does he wish to draw a distinction between "can" and "may"? We were furthermore painfully surprised to see the Galesburg Rule left suspended in mid-air, as it were.

It is true that the right course is not always easily discerned. Hard and fast formulas may do much harm, proving at times a device of legalism and at other times of indifference. But wherever there is the spirit of holy awe when God has spoken, where there is the sincere desire to remain faithful to everything that the Holy Scriptures inculcate, the right balance, even when momentarily lost through human weakness, will always be regained, and a Scriptural course will again be followed.

A.

**The Imprecatory Psalms.** — The *Lutheran Church Quarterly* (April, 1940) treats this old but always interesting subject in an article which closes with an apologetic borrowed from liberal Bible criticism and therefore opposed to the traditional explanation of believing Christian theologians. The writer declares: "If we study the religion, the ethics,

the culture, and the national traditions of ancient Judaism; if we sense the madness of the everlasting wars that sacked their cities, killed or wounded their best men, ravished their women, and murdered their babies, followed by pestilence, famine, economic confusion, and desolation of land and sanctuary, so that they feared national annihilation and the desertion of the God who alone could help them; and realizing how far for generations they had been debauched by weak and godless rulers, — I say, reviewing all these facts and forces, what other appeal could those ill-starred tribes make than utter frenzied cries to all the powers in the upper and nether world to curse the bloody, idolatrous hordes that almost brought them to extinction? When, oh, when, would Messiah appear? Verily, the strings of David's harp gave forth many dulcet tones; but some of them contained much iron." To write this means to assume, after the fashion of the destructive higher critics, that the imprecatory psalms were not written by David but by some pseudo-David at a very late time in Israel's history; for at David's time (ca. 1000 B. C.) the Israelites could not look upon "generations debauched by weak and godless rulers." The time before David was rather (with exceptions, of course) one of conquest and victory for Israel, when the chosen people had every reason in the world to rejoice in the good fortune which it enjoyed by God's grace. For this reason the imprecatory psalms (e. g., 35, 41, 69, 109) could not have been motivated by any "madness of the everlasting wars, ravished women, murdered babies, and the fear of national annihilation." To motivate them in this manner is utterly absurd. Meusel, in his well-known *Kirchliches Handlexikon*, emphasizes the fact that these psalms must not be regarded as outbursts of personal hatred against sinners but as a demonstration of lawful zeal against sin." This is far more in accord with the spirit of the Psalter. The *Cyclopedia* of McClintock & Strong justifies them "partly by the atrocity of some of the crimes execrated and partly by the fact of special authority in the act of inspiration." Luther contributes the thought that the prayers in the psalms are directed either against the devil as a liar or against the devil as a murderer, that is, either against false teachers or against the tyrants who inflict [upon the Church] cross and persecution." (St. L. Ed., IV:1753.) Strong (*Systematic Theology*), too, interprets the imprecations as "the expression of judicial indignation against the enemies of God" and not as "the ebullition of personal anger." Admitting all this, we nevertheless must not overlook the Messianic element in these psalms, and when pious scholars prefixed to the imprecatory Psalm 109 the title "The affliction of David, a type of Christ's sufferings at the hands of His people," they suggested a solution which is still more satisfactory. Did not, after all, David utter these imprecations by divine inspiration as the mouth-piece of Christ, whose way-preparer, John the Baptist, called the Pharisees and Sadducees a "generation of vipers," warning them "to flee from the wrath to come," lest they be "hewn down and cast into the fire" (Matt. 3:7 ff.), and who Himself pronounced woe after woe upon those who perverted God's Word, hindered His cause, and interfered with the bringing of salvation by Him to the poor and contrite (Matt. 23:1 ff.)? The writer in the *Quarterly* certainly misrepresents facts when he says: "The

curse represented the inherent and inevitable blight upon evil. That blight might be death, diseases, weakness, madness, perplexity, misery, bad luck, or any other adversity to which flesh is heir. And so the last verse of the Old Testament is a threatening curse. But the opening message of the New is 'Blessed.' The religion of the Old Testament taught that the man who dared only touch a sacred thing, such as the Ark of the Covenant or the holy mount, was cursed with death. The New teaches that any one who touches sacred things, even the body of Christ, may live and be saved. *So, then, let us not look for Christian ethical concepts in the primitive morality of ancient tribes — which is reading history backward.*" (Italics in original.) Anything more false and misleading could not have been written on this point. It is so altogether against the testimony of Christ and the apostles that one wonders how it could have been penned by a Lutheran. Christ's witness on this point is indeed clear and decisive. The Old Testament Scriptures testify of Him, John 5:39. They set forth God's Word, Matt. 15:3, not any "primitive morality of ancient tribes." He Himself extols and inculcates the morality of the Old Testament as perfect and binding all men at all times, Matt. 22:36-40. Christ recognizes no "evolution of morality and religion" in the Holy Bible, for He quotes even Genesis as divine truth, Matt. 19:5. And so does St. Peter: "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," 2 Pet. 1:21; and St. Paul: "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness," 2 Tim. 3:16. Essentially there is no difference in content between the Old Testament and the New, even though there is greater clarity in the latter; both contain Law and Gospel, the divine message of wrath and of grace. To say that the Old Testament closes with a curse and the New begins with a "Blessed" is simply not true. Both Testaments close in the same way, with a Gospel-message of love for those who believe and a Law-message of wrath and punishment for those who reject God's free grace and pervert His Word. (Cf. Mal. 4:5, 6 with Rev. 22:18-21.) Let all who write in the spirit of the article just quoted beware lest they themselves come under the condemnation of the righteous God, whose warning reads: "Be not deceived; God is not mocked," Gal. 6:7.

J. T. M.

**Brief Items.**—Twelve new languages in which the Scriptures had not previously been published were added last year, bringing the total number of languages into which some part of the Bible has now been translated to 1,051, according to the American Bible Society. — *Christian Century*.

From Tokyo a correspondent writes the *Christian Century* that, while many large missions are removing their workers from Japan, Korea, and occupied China, no one hears of Roman Catholic missionaries leaving on account of the present difficulties. The same correspondent states that the Episcopalians have refused to join the National United Church of Japan, a stand for which we give them credit. Besides, "no body representative of the entire Presbyterian Reformed Communion has yet officially approved participation" in this federation. A.

---

## Book Review — Literatur

---

All books reviewed in this periodical may be procured from or through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

**Christ in the Pentateuch.** By Josiah B. Tidwell. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. 364 pages, 5¼×7½. Price, \$2.75.

It is refreshing to find a book published which so clearly teaches the verbal inspiration of the Bible and the deity and vicarious atonement of Jesus Christ prophesied also in the Old Testament. Unfortunately too much speculation on matters not revealed in the Bible mars the usefulness of the book. There is, *e.g.*, no indication in Scripture that Adam suffered or that God shed Adam's blood to create Eve. (P.64.) Nor is there any statement in Scripture justifying the assumption that "God set up at the east side of the garden an altar of justice and mercy. The cherubim and fiery presence (chap.3:24) are the same as those He later instructed Moses to use in connection with the altar of mercy and grace on the Ark of the Covenant in the Tabernacle (Ex.25:18,22)." — "The offering demanded here at the gate of the Garden was a sin-offering. It had to be burned on the outside of the garden and its blood (poured-out life) placed upon the mercy-seat to make atonement for sin." "It was here, then, that all offerings for sin were to be presented and where men were approvingly accepted or were rejected by the Lord. This was the scene of the sacrifices of Cain and Abel, who came to God with their offerings." "The flaming sword was not therefore for the purpose of shutting up the way of the tree of life to prevent men from coming to it but to open up to sinful man a merciful way back to that tree." (Pp.28,29.)

Other unwarranted statements are found. We are told: "It is to be noted that this seventh day on which God rested was not the seventh but the first day of man's life. The Eden Sabbath was the first day of human life." (P.67.) Man was created not on the seventh but on the sixth day, so that the seventh day of creation was the second day of human life. The author holds that the Sabbath was one of the three things man brought out of Eden, the other two being labor and marriage. The Sabbath "was therefore made for man as man, for the first man as the progenitor of all races and nations." (P.67.) The Sabbath as a divine institution dates only from the Mosaic legislation, Ex.20, and was intended only for the children of Israel; cp. Col.2:16,17. A disturbing printer's error crept in on page 265, where the heading "The Brazen Altar" should read "The Brazen Laver."

Though unwarranted speculations and statements mar the usefulness of the book, we find passages of surpassing beauty scattered throughout its pages, *e.g.*: "What a transcendent being was He that this terrible death on Calvary should be but the pricking of His heel, and more still, that the effort put forth by Satan in doing it would destroy Satan; or that the conflict was so unequal that in making His death-blow, the devil would be able to do no more than make the most insignificant

wound upon Jesus! This suggests the superiority of Jesus over Satan and physical things and shows us how suitable He is for us to trust. The one supreme Person, very God, is He, full of majesty and glory. How safe from the Serpent are all who shelter under His protection!" (Pp. 79, 80.)

TH. LAETSCH

**The Exegetical Grammar of the Greek New Testament.** By Wm. Douglas Chamberlain, M. A., Ph. D., D. D. The Macmillan Company, New York. 233 pages, 5½×8½. Price, \$4.00.

To all pastors and theological students who would like to review the chief grammatical facts pertaining to the Greek of the New Testament and who are looking for a somewhat new approach, we cordially recommend this book. It contains all the necessary grammatical material, both with respect to forms and syntax, and besides, it submits numerous hints which are of particular interest to the exegete. As far as the formal grammar part is concerned, the book is not exhaustive. It confines itself to what is essential. For that very reason it lends itself well to purposes of review. It is particularly the other feature of the book, the suggestions and principles pertaining to the interpretation of the text, which will be enjoyed by pastors and other Bible students acquainted with Greek. It is true that there is no grammar for New Testament Greek which does not to some extent include helpful hints for the interpreter. How can a person discuss a text endeavoring to illustrate some grammatical rule without making some remarks that an interpreter can use? But in this book the aim to serve the interpreter is always prominent. In the introduction a definition and discussion of exegesis are given. This is followed by several pages which deal with exegetical procedure. Next the author writes on the subject: "Building a Greek Vocabulary." What he stresses there are the prefixes and suffixes for nouns and verbs, which at once aid a person in determining to which general class from the point of view of significance the respective word belongs. These opening pages give the reader an idea of what he can expect in the body of the work. To illustrate the author's method, I shall submit what he says on the conjunction *δέ* (p. 150). "*Δέ*, 'and,' 'but.' The earliest usage seems to have been a 'continuative' use in narrative with the meaning 'in the next place.' In this sense it is used mainly in the historical books in the New Testament, especially in Matthew and Luke. A good passage illustrating the mere copulative force is the genealogical table Matt. 1:2-16. The adversative use, 'on the other hand,' 'but,' will be discussed under adversative conjunctions." — Where adversative conjunctions are spoken of (p. 151), we find these remarks: "*Δέ* is often adversative: *μὴ θησαυρίζετε . . . θησαυρίζετε δέ* (Matt. 6:19), 'Quit laying up treasure . . . but keep on laying up.' In Jas. 1:13 it is continuative, but in v. 14 it is adversative. In *ἐγὼ ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς ὕδατι, αὐτὸς δὲ βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ* (Mark 1:8), 'I baptized you with water, but He shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit,' the *δέ* contrasts the agents, the media, and the time of John's and Jesus' baptism. Often the contrast is made more manifest by the use of *μέν*: *ἐγὼ μὲν . . . ὁ δὲ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος* (Matt. 3:11), 'I, on the one hand; . . . but, on the other hand, the One coming after me.'" — Generally speaking, the author

has adopted the views of Robertson with respect to grammatical definitions and distinctions, for instance, in reference to conditional clauses. The work is well printed. The suggestion might be made that several pastors jointly buy the book and, setting aside an hour or two a week, together review the grammatical material underlying the exegesis of the Greek text. May the work accomplish the noble purposes for which it was written!

W. ARNDT

**The Gospel According to St. Luke.** By G. C. Gast. Supplemented by H. E. Koch. Prepared under the auspices of the Luther League of the American Lutheran Church. The Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O. 190 pages, 5×7¼. Paper binding. Price, 35 cts.

The title-page of this work, whose chief author is a member of the Lutheran Seminary faculty at Columbus, O., gives information on the nature and purpose of this work. In explaining the aim more fully, the author says (p. 10): "The lesson expositions in this course were prepared for the youth of the Church who are of high-school age with a view of acquainting them with Dr. Luke's missionary gospel, so that, like Theophilus, to whom it was originally addressed, they may become more certain of the facts of salvation in Jesus Christ wherein they have been taught in Sunday-school and in catechetical classes. If this objective has been attained, it is certain that the course can be used by groups of Christians of more advanced age. In which cases the author sincerely prays the same effect may accrue. The magnifying of Jesus' Messiahship in mortal minds in modern times is the pole-star of the purpose of this gospel-study. The more specific aim of the course may be expressed in this way, *viz.*, that the pupil will know the thought content of Luke's gospel; that he will better understand its message and meaning for his own soul and life; that he will be moved to a deeper appreciation of, and more intense love for, the Son of Man and Son of God, his personal Savior and Lord; that he will be guided into channels of living discipleship, the most natural expression of the challenge this study has presented to him in the portrayal of the life and work of that perfect Son of Man whom the Father has exalted to His right hand in glory. Thus will be accomplished in the pupil's life what occurred in Theophilus's life, and the Gospel's missionary purpose will again prevail. And where this happens, without a doubt, it will move the pupil to greater mission-mindedness, so that he will be more ready to speak of the things he has mentally seen and heard in the study of this gospel."

The form into which the material is cast is quite helpful. The work follows the chapter division of our King James Version somewhat closely, that is, the book has twenty-four chapters. Each chapter of the book is divided into paragraphs, all of which are provided with brief headings giving the contents. The paragraphs in as few words as possible set forth the chief contents of the respective gospel section, providing explanations where necessary. At the end of the chapter is given in smaller type a section headed "For Study and Discussion," in which attention is drawn to important points chiefly through questions that are to be answered by the students or the class. To avoid misunderstanding, we

ought to add that the text of St. Luke is not printed; every student or class-member is supposed to have his Bible before him. As to exegetical questions, in which every minister is interested, we might mention that the author holds the Gospel of St. Luke was probably written about 60 A.D. (p. 24). From the introductory chapter we take over this interesting paragraph: "He [Luke] had another qualification for this self-imposed assignment—he was well educated. To be a practicing physician in those times one had to pass a rigorous examination in order to receive a diploma. This was Roman law. Thus Dr. Luke had to be well schooled. And he gives evidence of this, not in the use of medical terms and phrases employed in his writings (physicians of that day had not invented a special medical vocabulary as today), but rather in the high quality of his literary style and flow of language. The opening sentence (1:1-4) of his gospel has been compared to the prefaces of such Greek writers as Thucydides, Herodotus, and their kind, except that he is always modest, while they were inclined to be vainglorious. He had a historian's intuition, for he makes the most of his material. He writes in a popular vein, but the impress of culture and his cosmopolitan outlook never disappear from his writings. His vocabulary was very extensive, whence we find 750 words in his books not used elsewhere by Bible writers. 312 of these occur in his gospel to distinguish it" (p. 22 f.). The author evidently takes the inspiration of Luke's gospel for granted. On account of debates going on at present, we wish he had discussed it.

To give the reader an idea of the exegetical comments submitted here, we reprint the remarks dealing with "A Visit at Bethany, 10:38-42": "Next to the story of the Good Samaritan Luke places this exquisite scene of domestic life. Jesus has come to Bethany, about two miles from Jerusalem, the home of these two sisters, for a brief visit. Martha, evidently the head of the household, at once sets about to prepare an elaborate meal for her distinguished Guest. Mary prefers to sit at Jesus' feet as His pupil. Martha, however, looks with disapproval upon her sister's apparent disinterest in Jesus' physical comfort and appeals to Jesus to order Mary to help her. There will be time enough to listen to Jesus when the housework is finished. But Jesus justifies Mary's choice and mildly rebukes Martha for her distraction with the details of serving Him. Mary has chosen the better part, the one thing needful for her soul: to let Jesus be her Host rather than her Guest. Both sisters showed their love for Jesus, but Mary understood Him better than Martha. She seemed to sense that He preferred to impart spiritual truth to being served fine food (John 4:34). She was concerned to attend upon the Lord without distraction (1 Cor. 7:35). After this visit Jesus returned to continue His Perea ministry." It will be seen from this little excerpt that what is here placed before us in the way of comments is brief, helpful, to the point, edifying.

W. ARNDT

**What do We Know about Life after Death?** By Ross H. Stover, D. D., Pastor Messiah Lutheran Church, Philadelphia. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. 105 pages, 5×7½. Price, \$1.00.

It was a pleasure to read this booklet. Dr. Stover takes his answers to various questions relating to the life after death from Scripture.

What he does not know he does not attempt to tell. And what Scripture tells us he repeats in simple, forceful language. He takes the Scriptural position, for instance, on the question of salvation in "Hades." "Does an unbeliever have an opportunity after death to accept Christ and receive His salvation?" Most of the leading Lutheran theologians of today hold out such a hope to the unbeliever. Our booklet, however, states: "It is that word 'preach' (in 1 Pet. 3:18-20) which leads many to believe in the second opportunity for salvation. . . . There are two Greek words translated 'preach.' One is *εὐαγγελίζομαι* and the second is *κηρύσσω*. The word *εὐαγγελίζομαι* means preaching the Gospel of Christ so that men might be brought to an acceptance of God's salvation. It is today's Gospel-preaching. Evangelize! This word is not used in the above text. . . . The word *κηρύσσω* means preach in the sense of pronouncement. It is legal preaching. . . . As far as I understand the Bible, I cannot find a verse in Scripture which would lead one to believe that there is an opportunity for salvation after death. In fact, the opposite is the very clear teaching of God's Word." A number of pertinent passages are quoted — In some instances misleading phrases are used. For example: "During the three days between His death and His resurrection He visited both hell and Paradise." "All of the Bible's descriptions of heaven localize it as a place." However, the next paragraph states: "Heaven is a *spiritual* place," and that sets the matter right. "Spiritual death" — dead in trespasses and sin, separation from God. . . . Jesus experienced both temporal and spiritual death on Calvary's cross." Of course, Dr. Stover does not want the "dead in trespasses" to apply to Christ. "The very ideals of democracy will live or die with belief in immortality." Scripture does not say this. This quotation had better be omitted. — The booklet is worth a cent a page, surely; but as book values go, the price seems rather high; perhaps the fine mechanical make-up necessitated that.

TH. ENGELDER

**The Witness of His Enemies.** By G. P. Pettigrew. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. 110 pages,  $5\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$ . Price, \$1.00.

**Calvary's Afterglow.** By Kenneth M. Monroe. Same publishers. 52 pages. Price, 25 cts.

**The Overcoming Christ.** By Karl H. Moore. Same publishers. 140 pages,  $5\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$ . Price, \$1.00.

These three books are published in witness of the truth of Scripture against Modernism. The first, *The Witness of His Enemies*, written by a minister who holds a degree in Law, bases its evidences of the truth of the Gospel on the overwhelming testimony found in the admissions of Christ's enemies against their interest. The writer shows conclusively that throughout the Savior's life the actions and attitudes of the opposing Pharisees, Sadducees, and Herodians prove the truth of His affirmations concerning His divine majesty, sinlessness, miraculous power, fulfillment of Old Testament prophecies, vicarious death, His resurrection, etc. This novel method of confirming the divine truth results in interesting reading, especially since the author always keeps in mind the strengthening of Christian believers in their faith and the winning of

unbelievers for Christ. In his closing appeal the author shows that the world needs Christ as Savior and Lord and that Liberalism has no salvation to offer to a perishing world.

*Calvary's Afterglow*, written by the Dean of the Bible Institute of Los Angeles after a second visit in the Holy Land, describes the "Skull Hill" and the "Garden Tomb" and then expands the proof for the truth of the Gospel lying in the Savior's glorious resurrection from the dead. It concludes with a stirring appeal that, unless with St. Paul men will accept the risen Christ in true faith, nothing is left to them but utter hopelessness and despair.

*The Overcoming Christ* treats the Gospel according to St. John, chapter by chapter, showing under proper heads the glorious Christ whom the evangelist portrays: "the World-Illuminating Christ," "the Miraculous Christ," "the Soul-winning Christ," "the Sinner's Christ," "the Praying Christ," etc. While the books betray the peculiar religious background of their writers, they are unanimous in attesting Christ's deity, His vicarious atonement, and the universal salvation secured by His redemption; and the reviewer wishes to express his joy at the fact that opportunity is given believing ministers by such Christian publishers as Zondervan to witness the Christian faith to thousands in our country who refuse to bow their knees to the Baalim of Modernism. From the approach and presentation of the subject-matter in these books there is much to learn as to how to witness the everlasting Gospel appealingly and effectively.

J. THEODORE MUELLER

**Religion and the Modern World.** University of Pennsylvania Bicentennial Conference. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. 192 pages, 6¼×9¼. Price, \$2.00.

This notable publication is, in the reviewer's opinion, indispensable for all who desire a bird's eye view of modern trends in present-day Catholic and Protestant liberal theology. Scholarly and often technical, yet not too difficult for the average minister to understand, it presents fifteen timely essays: three on modern trends, of which one is general, another represents European Protestant theology, and a third modern trends in Catholicism; two on the problem of ethics in a changing world; two on religion and higher education; three on the Church in its relation to the social order; two on the Church as a "world force"; and three on modern Christian-Jewish relations. The essays thus furnish a fairly adequate picture of what modern Liberals have to say in the present crisis. Of the fifteen essays some appealed to the reviewer as especially noteworthy. "Contemporary Renewals in Religious Thought" (Jacque Maritain) gives a fine survey of the outstanding theological and philosophical tendencies of today from the viewpoint of a Catholic scholar. "Modern Trends in Catholic Theology" (Wm. J. McGarry, a noted Jesuit professor of theology) interprets Catholic thought to the modern world. His essay is no doubt the most scholarly and shows clearly Rome's unchanged stand on its traditional dogmas and its desire for union, conceived, of course, as the return of non-Catholics into the bosom of *mater ecclesia*. Dr. McGarry announces as the two principal

topics in Catholic thought today the assumption of Mary into heaven and the office of Mary as mediatrix of all graces. While neither of these is "an article of faith," still both are "definable" because they are "contained implicitly in view of Our Lady's privilege, which is the heritage of the past tradition of the Church and ultimately derives from the apostles." This doctrine means that "the Mother of God died, that her soul and body were separated, were united again, and that Mary, in risen form, was assumed into heaven just as Christ ascended thither from Olivet and as we shall rise, if saved [?], on the Last Day" (p. 36). In "Ethics in a Changing World" Prof. P. J. Tillich, now at Union Theological Seminary, shows how little he has understood the nature, function, and all-sufficiency of Christian love in sanctification when he accuses Luther of forgetting "in his great emphasis on the creativity of love" the need of laws and institutions, and then judges (very unjustly so): "This is one of the reasons why the moral education of the German masses is less thorough than that in the Calvinistic countries" (p. 60). In "Religion and Action" Reinhold Niebuhr again calls attention to the sinfulness of man, though he opposes "the literal interpretation of the Fall as an historical event" (p. 103). Man's "sin springs from his spiritual capacities [?] and is defined as pride and self-glorification" (p. 102). Niebuhr thus shows that he is not returning to orthodox theology, even though he has become more positive in his expressions on sin. But no amount of quotation and no review, no matter how lengthy, can do justice to the essays offered in this book for study. One must read them slowly and carefully, and then one will find that, after all, modern Protestant Liberalism and Catholicism are not so very far apart in rejecting the essence of Christian orthodoxy, the *sola Scriptura* and the *sola gratia*, though both skilfully make use of formulas designed to deceive those that are not sufficiently rooted in the Christian faith.

J. THEODORE MUELLER

**God Save the Home.** By W. E. Schuette. Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O. 72 pages, 5½×7¾. Price, 60 cts.

The well-known author had been asked by the Commission on Parish Education of the American Lutheran Conference to write a book on "The Home" which would be adaptable for use in study groups. In the "Apology" prefacing the book he makes the following remarks: "I well knew that a book written with this as its chief purpose might be strongly represented on book-house shelves an immovable asset (liability) and nothing more. For this reason my thought was to create a readable book which could serve as a gift-book and which might possibly be more widely circulated and actually read. In order to make this work suitable for study groups also (may their number increase!), I appended questions and other suggestions."

The author has succeeded in writing a very fascinating booklet, which may be placed into the hands of our congregation-members. The appended seven pages of questions prove the author to be an experienced teacher, who knows how to create and maintain the interest of a class by thought-provoking questions. A form for conducting family devotions fittingly concludes the book.

TH. LAETSCH

**The Technique of Composition.** Third Edition. By Kendall B. Taft, John Francis McDermott, and Dana O. Jensen. Farrar & Rinehart, Inc., 508 W. 26th St., New York. 628 pages, 6×8½. Price, \$1.40.

In reviewing what may be called a schoolbook, *The Technique of Composition*, I am deviating from our usual custom of reviewing theological or religious literature. The reason for so doing is obvious when we consider that the technique of the sermon does not essentially differ from that of the ordinary composition. The sermon does differ in respect to the source of its material, which is the Word of God, and in respect to its purpose, which is the salvation of blood-bought souls to the glory of God. But if the preacher would write and preach a good sermon, as far as its literary make-up is concerned, he must know the technique of composition. The revised third edition of this book which has just come from the press, will serve the sermonizer most admirably. It instructs him in reference to the mechanics of writing and the forms of writing. It not only recalls to his mind the fundamentals of good grammar, sentence structure, punctuation, diction, style, and logic, but also tells him how to write a paragraph, organize his material, and prepare his manuscript; it shows what the aim of composition should be, and speaks of its qualities, form, and importance; also says what precise writing is, how to prepare a research paper, how to write a book review; and gives a glossary of faulty expressions and overworked words and phrases. A large number of examples is a feature which adds much to the value of the book. Considering the material offered on 600 pages,—well done, well printed, and well bound,—the price is very reasonable. I recommend that theological students and preachers add this book to their library and use it.

J. H. C. FRITZ

#### BOOKS RECEIVED

*From Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.:*

**Great Questions.** Daily Devotions June 2 to July 26, 1941. No. 32. By Lawrence Acker. 63 pages, 3½×5¾. Price: Per copy, 5 cts.; per dozen, 48 cts., plus postage; 100, \$3.00, plus postage.

**"Wer ist wie der Herr, unser Gott?"** Kurze Andachten fuer die Zeit vom 2. Juni bis zum 26. Juli 1941. By Geo. J. S. Beyer.

*From Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich.:*

**Nature Sermons.** By Fred Hartley Wight. 106 pages, 5¼×7½. Price, \$1.00.

**Walking with God.** By W. P. Hall. 115 pages, 5¼×7½. Price, \$1.00.

**The Father's House and the Way There.** By H. A. Ironside. 248 pages, 6×9. Price, \$1.00.

**Lemon's Bible Game.** By J. B. Lemon. Price, 75 cts., postpaid.

*From Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, London, and Edinburgh:*

**Christ and Human Personality.** By J. C. Massee, D. D., LL. D. 127 pages, 5×7¾. Price, \$1.25.

**Christ Is God.** By Archibald Rutledge. 47 pages, 5×7½. Price, 75 cts.

*From Dodd, Mead & Company, New York:*

**Women of the Bible.** By H. V. Morton. 204 pages, 5½×8. Price, \$2.00.